CORPUS
SCRIPTORUM CHRISTIANORUM ORIENTALIUM
EDITUM CONSILIO
UNIVERSITATIS CATHOLICAE AMERICAE
ET UNIVERSITATIS CATHOLICAE LOVANIENSIS
Vol. 360
SCRIPTORES SYRI
TOMUS 158

A COLLECTION OF UNPUBLISHED SYRIAC LETTERS OF CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

TRANSLATED

BY

R.Y. EBIED and L.R. WICKHAM

LOUVAIN
SECRÉTARIAT DU CORPUSSCO
WAVERSEBAAN, 49
1975

ISBN 2-8017-0005-3

© 1975 by Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.

Tous droits de reproduction, de traduction ou d'adaptation, y compris les microfilms, de ce volume ou d'un autre de cette collection, réservés pour tous pays, y compris l'URSS.

D/1975/0602/2

Imprimerie Orientaliste, s.p.r.l., Louvain (Belgique)

861244

INTRODUCTION

I

The pieces of Cyril here translated from the Syriac version contained in MS B.M. add. 14,557 (for further details of which see the Introduction to the volume containing the text, pp. VI f) belong to the period after the Council of Ephesus (431) and Cyril's break from, and subsequent *rapprochement* with, John of Antioch.

Their contents we briefly now summarize.

a) *The Letter on the Nicene Creed* [written A.D. 438]

This is a short doctrinal treatise cast in the form of a letter addressed to certain named clergy and more generally to the Eastern monks. Cyril's theme is that the Nicene Creed rightly interpreted is a refutation of Nestorianism.

After complimenting his recipients on their desire for orthodox teaching and discoursing upon the necessity for right faith [§§ 1-3] he affirms the infallibility and inspiration of the Creed of Nicaea [§ 4]. However, this Creed has received a heretical and distorted interpretation at the hands of Nestorians and Cyril proposes to expound its true significance [§§ 5-6]. There follows the Symbol of Nicaea [§ 7] and a line by line exposition of it. §§ 8-12 treat of the Godhead and of Creation; §§ 13-29 of the "economy" i.e. God's plan of salvation through the incarnation of the Son. A wide variety of scriptural texts from the Old and New Testaments attest the real incarnation of the one, unique and self-identical Son of God. Proclus of Constantinople's striking words are also quoted [§ 29]. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, briefly touched on in the Creed, is treated with a corresponding brevity [§ 30]. The letter concludes with an exhortation to avoid the novel inventions of Nestorius and Theodore and to follow the mind of the holy fathers and the tradition of Scripture [§ 31].

b) *The Letter to Acacius of Melitene* [written probably at the beginning of A.D. 433]

The letter to Acacius contains Cyril's account and explanation of the doctrinal understanding he has reached with the Oriental bishops i.e. those who supported John of Antioch. It opens with a short paragraph

of greeting [§ 1] and goes on to describe the events of the Spring of 432. The emperor Theodosius had been advised that the schism between John and Cyril could only be ended by the decision of John to anathematize Nestorius and by Cyril's agreeing to overlook the insult done him by John's Council at Ephesus [§ 2].

Aristolaus the tribune was dispatched by the Emperor's orders to the Orientals to convey his decision. They persuaded Acacius of Beroea to write to Cyril in the same terms. Cyril found their stipulations too demanding, requiring him to recant his anti-Nestorian polemics and to follow only the Nicene Faith. Cyril declared that as for the Nicene Faith he does follow it and that, so far as his writings against Nestorius are concerned, they were soundly based. For their part the Orientals must anathematize Nestorius's doctrine, acknowledge his deposition and consent to the appointment of Nestorius's successor, Maximian [§ 3].

Paul of Emesa was now sent to Cyril with a letter from John of Antioch more provocative than persuasive. He paid no attention to it and the excuse of Christian zeal he treated with contempt. It was not enough that Paul (as representative of the Orientals) should anathematize Nestorius — the Orientals must do it as a body including John of Antioch. This having ocurred, the controversy was brought to an end [§ 4].

Cyril goes on now to explain that this reconciliation involves him in no departure from his previously expressed views [§§ 5-6]. The Statement of Faith accepted by the two parties involves no departure from, or addition to, the Faith of Nicaea, and is quite different from the blasphemies of Nestorius [§§ 7-8]. Nestorius clearly confesses two Sons and denies the title "Mother of God" to the Blessed Virgin Mary, whereas it is clear that the Orientals acknowledge the one Son, consubstantial with the Father in his Godhead and with us in his manhood, and the Virgin as the "Mother of God" [§§ 9-11]. At the level of speculation, two mutually dissimilar natures prior to the incarnation are conceived of, but after the incarnation there is one nature of the Son [§ 12].

In reply to the allegation that to talk of two natures implies the atttribution of scriptural statements to two distinct subjects, Cyril quotes the fourth of his anathemas directed at Nestorius in his third letter. He is not, he says, denying the difference inherent in expressions but the dividing them out into two distinct persons. At the level of speculation, he reiterates, there are two realities unconfusedly conjoined, but

after the union there is no separation but one Christ [§§ 13-14]. This is quite different from Nestorius for whom the difference of natures involves a difference of persons. The Antiochenes accept a theoretical distinction of natures but an indivisible person [§ 15]. They make a three-fold distinction in scriptural expressions; those that pertain to Christ's Godhead, those pertaining to his manhood and thirdly those pertaining jointly to both. Such a distinction by no means implies a dual personality in Christ and, moreover, the Orientals acknowledge the Holy Virgin as "Mother of God" — all of which is a far cry from Nestorianism [§§ 16-18]. The Orientals are moved to make the distinction by anxiety to avoid Arianism [§ 19]. As for the charge made by John of Antioch that Cyril has publicly taught a distinction of natures and a corresponding personal distinction in the scriptural expressions and for the other charge that his christology is Arian or Apollinarian, Cyril firmly rejects them. He recognizes a distinction in our Lord's utterances because he is at once God and Man [§ 20]. The doctrine of Athanasius, as expressed in his letter to Epictetus (where the true text of the letter is preserved) faithfully expresses the traditional Orthodoxy [§ 21]. Philip of Rome's letter reporting Xystus's disagreement with the conclusions of the Council of Ephesus is to be disregarded as is any letter purporting to be his and declaring a change of heart about that Council [§ 22].

c) *The First Letter to Succenus* [written c. A.D. 433-435]

Cyril opens with the usual compliments and an assertion that his own position is the traditional one [§ 1]. Succensus has asked whether we are to use the formula "two natures" of Christ. Diodore and Nestorius, says Cyril, think of two "Sons", one human and the other divine joined in a moral union such that to the human are imputed the attributes of the divine. Nestorius's denial of the title *Θεοτόκος* to the Blessed Virgin Mary, arising out of his distinction between divine and human attributes as used in the New Testament, indicates the real duality he feigns to shun. Cyril's doctrine, instead, is the incarnation of the eternal Word, unique and individual, possessed of his own body as we are [§§ 2-4]. It is not Apollinarianism to speak of a single Son, who, while remaining one and the same, acquired the essentials of humanity including mentality; human and divine in him are not fused but distinguishable [§§ 5-6] in the same way as soul and body are in the human person i.e. as conceptually distinct factors in an ac-

tual unity [§ 7]. Christ's body, the vehicle of pain in his earthly ministry, was glorified at the Resurrection; it acquired man's pristine qualities, became supra-human and in a sense divine; but it was not, and could not be, changed into deity [§§ 8-10].

With this letter Cyril sends a copy of Athanasius's *Ad Epictetum* free from Nestorian falsifications, and two other works prove his unwavering stand against Nestorius [§§ 11-12].

d) *The Second Letter to Succensus* [written sometime after the previous letter]

Cyril deals with four objections raised by Succensus. To the objection that "a single, incarnate nature of the Word" implies the Word's suffering, he answers that it is the assumed element which suffered, the Word remaining impassible [§ 2]. Moreover (second objection), it implies no reduction in the human nature through absorption in the divine for each remains distinct in the union [§ 3]. The third objection is more complicated and must be taken to continue the previous argument. It asks how the same Christ can be at once fully man and fully God if there is no continuing human nature. Cyril answers that to talk of the single *incarnate* nature of the Word is to imply full manhood (single nature would not) and to this belong the sufferings. The continuing human nature is not a distinct human individual as the Nestorians suppose [§ 4]. The last problem concerns Christ's sufferings again. If they were rational and voluntary they imply Christ's full humanity and hence two continuing indivisible natures. True, says Cyril, but the two do not constitute two individual beings in a moral unity. The duality is simply conceptual [§ 5].

e) *The Letter to Eulogius* [written A.D. 433]

Cyril writes to his envoy at Constantinople. As a result of the formula of reunion between himself and John of Antioch (the "Orientals") with its mention of a distinction of natures in Christ, the Nestorians are claiming a victory for their position. No, answers Cyril. "Two natures" was a phrase used in order to get rid of the suspicion of Apollinarianism and it must be taken with the mention of their union. Union implies diverse elements (as Athanasius's *Letter to Epictetus* makes clear) but no real and continuing duality such as the Nestorians believe [§ 1]. Eulogius is finally told to publicize Cyril's views by distributing copies of his letters and in particular to give the Chamberlain (Chrysoretes) copies of his major statements in the controversy and also Athanasius's *Ad Epictetum* [§ 2].

II

METHOD OF TRANSLATING THE TEXT

The procedure adopted in editing the text we have described in the Introduction to the volume containing the text on pp. xviii f. We have also set out there on pp. ix ff some of the peculiarities in the relation between the original Greek text and its Syriac translation. Where the Syriac translator may be presumed to have had before him a text different from that established by Schwartz we have noted that fact in the apparatus to the text. In the notes to the English translation we call attention to particular points in respect of the Syriac version e.g. the apparent following of a different Greek text from any known to Schwartz, omissions, additions, idiosyncratic renderings, mistranslation and so on. In the case of the translation of the Letter on the Nicene Creed, the two Letters to Succensus and that to Eulogius, these annotations have a certain claim to be complete i.e. all significant variations in the Syriac translation have been noted. In the case, though, of the Letter to Acacius of Melitene to have included all the points at which the translation into Syriac varies from the original would almost have involved the reprinting of the whole of Schwartz's text. We have confined ourselves here to indicating the most striking points (see discussion above).

Our English translation keeps closely to the Syriac text. We hope that it represents the understanding that a native Greek-less speaker of Syriac might have of the originals. Needless to say, those who want to acquaint themselves with the writings of Cyril of Alexandria would be best advised in the first instance to consult the original text. The translation will have served its purpose if it clarifies not Cyril himself but the non-Chalcedonian Syriac interpretation of Cyril, an interpretation which has claim to a certain importance in its own right. As we have said, the translation is fairly literal so far as the English language permits. Words or phrases necessary to complete the sense, but lacking a word for word counterpart in the Syriac text, have been added in square brackets. Both Syriac text and English translation follow Schwartz's paragraph numbering.

In scriptural quotations and allusions we follow no single English Biblical translation. Our Syriac translators appear often enough to echo the New Testament Peshitta without pedantically repeating it

(the Old Testament quotations are rendered directly from Cyril's LXX) and we are happy to follow their example.

III

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following list of works is not intended to be exhaustive; we only mention major works of immediate relevance to the pieces here edited.

I. For the historical background to these letters the reader is advised to consult the standard Church histories, histories of doctrine, encyclopedia articles and patrologies. The following may perhaps be singled out as especially useful:
Histoire de l'église, vol. 4 - *De la mort de Théodose à l'élection de Grégoire le Grand* by P. DE LABRIOLLE and others in the series of vols ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin (Paris, 1948).

The various prefaces scattered throughout E. SCHWARTZ's *A.C.O.*, together with articles in his *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin, 1938-60), his *Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor* [Sitz. Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl., Bd. 208, Abh. 4 (1928)] and other pieces, are of the highest importance for the study of this period. L. DE TILLEMONT's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (Paris, 1709), though old, is still valuable. J. KOPALLIK's *Cyrillus von Alexandrien. Eine Biographie* (Mainz, 1881) remains the only work of its kind and contains useful summaries of Cyril's writings. A simple and lively treatment of the issues is to be found in G.L. PRESTIGE, *Fathers and Heretics*, Lectures VI and VII (London, 1963); and of the historical framework in R.V. SELLERS, *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, 1961).

II. For the Syriac text and MS tradition consult:

1. W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1871f), *ad. loc.*
2. P. BEDJAN, *Nestorius, le livre de Héraclide de Damas...* avec plusieurs appendices (Paris, 1910).
3. P.E. PUSEY, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli... Epistolae tres oecumenicae... scholia de incarnatione unigeniti* (Oxford, 1875).
4. P.E. PUSEY, *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli... de Recta Fide ad Imperatorem, de Incarnatione Unigeniti Dialogus*, etc. (Oxford, 1877).

5. A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922; reprinted Berlin, 1968).
6. J. LEBON, "Altération doctrinale de la Lettre à Épictète de S. Athanase" in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 31 (1935), pp. 713-61.
7. G.M. DE DURAND, *Deux Dialogues Christologiques* [Sources Chrétiennes, No. 97] (Paris, 1964).
8. A. VAN ROEY, "Deux Fragments inédits des Lettres de Succensus, Evêque de Diocésarée à Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie" in *Le Muséon*, vol. 55 (1942), pp. 87-92.

I

*ON THE SYMBOL OF THE FAITH BY BLESSED CYRIL • p. 1

1. Greetings in our [1] Lord from Cyril to the dear beloved priests, Anastasius, Alexander, Martinian, John and Paregorius, and Maximinius [2] the deacon; and the rest of the heads of eastern [3] monastic houses, and to those who practise monastic discipline with you and are rooted in the faith of God.

Your studiousness and diligence, dear friends, I have now also found extraordinarily estimable [4] and I declare it is worthy of thorough praise [5]. For how could one fail particularly to desire [6] that a man should yearn for divine teachings and should be diligent in loving the correct course of the divine Faith? [7] For it is a business productive of endlessly long life [8], and diligence in these matters does not go unrewarded. For our Lord Jesus Christ at one point said to God the Father, who is in heaven: "This is eternal life: that they should know thee, the sole, true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" [9].

2. For the Faith, correct and irreproachable, possessing the beauty [1] which comes from good works, fills us with all good things and shows us worthy [2] of excellent glory. But brilliance of conduct, [brilliance] which is shown to be isolated from [3] correct doctrines and the blameless Faith, is, I think, never at all of profit to man's soul. For just as Faith is dead without works [4], so we assert that the converse too holds true. Therefore, let the Faith's truth [5] shine out together * with the boast of • p. 2
your noble [6] lives. For in this way we are made perfect [7] in accordance with the law of all-wise Moses. For he said: "Thou shalt be perfect before the Lord thy God" [8]. But as for those who, out of ignorance, are reluctant to acquire correct faith and want to preen themselves on the humility of their behaviour, they are like someone whose countenance has a fair appearance but they possess a mistaken and distorted in-

1 [1] Gk. lacks "our". — [2] *Μαξίμῳ*. — [3] Gk. lacks "eastern". — [4] *ἐπαινέσας ἔχω*. — [5] "praise" -*λόγου*. — [6] "Particularly to desire" -*ὑπεραγάσαιτο*. — [7] "divine Faith" -*τῶν ἱερῶν δογμάτων*. — [8] Om. *μακαρίας*. — [9] John 17:3.

2 [1] "beauty" -*φαιδρότητα* (om. *σύνδρομον*). — [2] "worthy" -*λαχόντας*. — [3] "isolated from" -*ἀμοιροῦσα*. — [4] James 2:20. — [5] "truth" -*τὸ ἀμώμητον*. — [6] Gk. lacks "your". — [7] "perfect" -*ἄρτιοι*. — [8] Deuteronomy 18:3.

tellectual judgement [9]. The result is that what was spoken by God through the voice of Jeremiah to the mother of the Jews (Jerusalem, I mean) will apply to them: "Behold thine eyes are not straight [10], nor is thine heart good" [11].

3. First and foremost, then, let us get a sound mind and a recollection of the divine Scripture which cries out and says: "Let thine eyes see the straight path"[1]. Now correct vision, on the part of the eyes hidden within, occurs when it is able to consider as clearly and as narrowly [2] as it can, the words spoken of God. For we see 'in a glass', and know 'figuratively', 'in part'[3]. Yet he who reveals deep things out of darkness sheds the light of truth on those who have a mind to receive true knowledge about him. We ought, then, to cast ourselves down before God, saying: "Lighten mine eyes, that I sleep not unto death" [4]. For our slipping from the straight path of divine doctrine [5] is clearly none other than 'sleeping unto death'. Now we lapse from the truth when we do not follow the divine Scriptures [6], but turn our mental gaze [7] either to a disreputable preference, or to the propensity of persons who do not keep a straight path to the Faith, and [so] we are convicted before [all] the other things of injuring our own souls.

4. Let us then, who have the care of the truth, follow what has seemed good to the divine message which "those who were from the beginning
* p. 3 spectators and ministers of the word" [1] handed down to us * through the Holy Ghost. Their footsteps it was that our glorious fathers also endeavoured to follow, they who assembled some time at Nicea and defined the august and oecumenical symbol. Their companion, too, in council was Christ, for he said: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in their midst" [2]. For how can it be doubted that Christ was, unseen, the president of the whole mighty and holy synod, where [3] the confession of the Faith, pure and spotless, was laid down like an unshakeable base and immovable foundation for men throughout the earth? Or [4] how could Christ have been absent if he is, as wise Paul says, the one who laid it down [5]? For he said: "Other foundation

[9] "intellectual judgement" - *τῶν ὀμμάτων*. — [10] Gk. (LXX) lacks "straight". — [11] Jeremiah 22:17.

3 [1] Proverbs 4:25. — [2] "narrowly" lit. "scraped bare" (Gk. - *ἀπεξεσμένως*). — [3] Thus Syr. punctuates; om. second *καί*. — [4] Psalm 12:4. — [5] "divine doctrine" - *τῶν ἱερῶν δογμάτων*. — [6] "divine scriptures" - *ταῖς θεοπνεύστοις γραφαῖς*. — [7] "turn our mental gaze" - *τὰς τῆς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας ἀπονέμοντες ῥοπάς*.

4 [1] Luke 1:2. — [2] Matthew 18:20. — [3] Gk. lacks "where". — [4] *εἶτα*. — [5] "laid it down" - so apparently Syr.; Gk. *θεμέλιος* (translator read *θεμελιώτης*?).

can no man lay except the one which is laid, Jesus Christ" [6]. So the Faith laid down and defined by them, their successors too, the holy fathers and pastors of the laity, lights of the churches and skilful consecrators of the mysteries [7], preserved without reproach. And it is impossible to perceive any occurrence at all of an omission or neglect of matters necessarily requisite for our benefit in their [8] confessions or symbols, those they produced touching the pure and orthodox Faith, for the reproof and abolition of all heresies [9] and loud-mouthed wickedness and for the confirmation and security of those who keep a straight path to the Faith, on whom the star [10], which shows up the dawn, has risen and day dawned (as the Scriptures have it) and whom the grace of the Holy Ghost has filled with the light of the truth.

5. But seeing that your Reverences have written that certain persons are perverting the meaning of the words contained in the symbol, * * p. 4 either through not understanding it aright or because, as a result of becoming attached to the pamphlets of certain people, they are being carried away to a 'reprobate mind', it has therefore appeared to me to be necessary and appropriate that I should compose a discourse to you on these matters and explain correctly the symbol's meaning, telling you cursorily the view reached by me. And we follow throughout the confession and mind [1] of the holy fathers, investigating directly and unswervingly what was asserted by them. For just now the holy synod too, the one assembled by God's will at Ephesus I mean, has fairly and accurately condemned [2] Nestorius' wicked opinion, and the verbal novelties [3] of others, whether his successors or predecessors, who adhere to his opinion (an opinion which they have had the temerity to express orally or in writing) it has condemned along with him, pronouncing on them one and the same sentence. For inasmuch as a single individual was condemned for these impious verbal novelties, it was unnecessary to trouble themselves further over any individual [4] but, to put it so, over their heresy as a whole, that is to say the whole slander they have fabricated against the Church's trustworthy doctrine [5], by preaching 'two sons', by dividing the indivisible, and indicting heaven and earth on the charge of man-worship [6]. For the whole, holy company of superior spirits worship with us our one Lord, Jesus Christ.

[6] 1 Corinthians 3:11. — [7] *μυσταγωγοί*. — [8] Om. *τῶν πατέρων*. — [9] *αἱρέσεως*. — [10] Om. *λαμπρός*.

5 [1] "confession and mind" - *ὁμολογίαις τε καὶ δόξαις*. — [2] "has fairly and accurately condemned" - *ὁσίαν καὶ ἀκριβῆ κατενεγκοῦσα τὴν ψῆφον*. — [3] *κενοφωνίας*; Syr. clearly read *: καινοφωνίας*. — [4] "to trouble themselves further over any individual" - *καθ' ἑνός μᾶλλον ἐλθεῖν*. — [5] "trustworthy doctrine" - *εὐσεβῶν δογμάτων*. — [6] *ἀνθρωπολατρείας*.

6. Now in order that people should not be ignorant of the holy fathers' minds (that is to say the meaning of the symbol of the Faith which obtains and is preached in all God's churches) I set it out in the memoranda of the affairs transacted there, so that those who read the memoranda might know the proper way to understand the holy fathers' confession, that is to say * the clear and orthodox symbol of the Faith[1]. And I think your charities will also have read the book we wrote on these same matters. So, as I have just said, after again setting out the symbol [2] in this present treatise, I am going to turn back with God's aid, to what is necessary for explaining clearly each of the propositions in it. For I am conscious of what was written by glorious Peter [3]: "Be ready always to make your defence to everyone who asks you for an explanation of the faith you have" [4].

* p. 5

The Symbol of the Faith

7. We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Only-begotten who was begotten from the Father, that is, from the Father's substance, God from God, light from light, very God from very God, who was begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, through whom all things were made, things in heaven and things on earth, who because of us men and because of our salvation came down and was incarnate and made man and suffered [1] and rose on the third day and ascended to heaven and is coming to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. But those who say: "There was when he was not," and "Before he was begotten he was not", and that "he was made from nothing" or assert that "The Son of God is of a different hypostasis or substance," or is mutable or alterable - [these] the Apostolic and Catholic Church anathematizes.

8. They declared: "We believe in one God," and shook from their foundations all the doctrines of the heathen, those who "by asserting that they were wise, have made fools of themselves and have changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of corruptible man, of birds, of quadrupeds and reptiles" [1]. And they worshipped * 'creatures besides the creator' and were 'in bondage to the elements of the world' and supposed that there were innumerably many deities. Therefore, for the abolition of the error of polytheism, they named one God, following throughout the divine Scriptures and indicating the beauty of the truth to all under heaven [2]. And this also wise Moses did by saying plainly: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord" [3]. And the Master of all and Creator himself also said [4]: "Thou shalt have no other gods but me" [5]. And again he declared by the voice of the holy prophets: "I am the first God and I am after these, and there is none but me" [6]. It was a fine thing, then, that our holy fathers too spoke of believing in one God, when they were laying, as basis for the faith, the need to think and assert that there is one, and only one, God in nature and truth.

* p. 6

9. And they also call him "Father Almighty", so that along with the Father might enter in the indication of the Son, who is, in truth and substantially, the one in virtue of whom he is Father [1]. If he did not become Father in time, he has however been [2] eternally what he is (that is to say Father [one] who exists far removed [3] from all that is created, in exalted heights. For the fact of holding sway [4], of being Lord of all, brings him especial [5] and peerless glory.

10. And they say, "all things were created by him, things in heaven and things on earth", so that from this too may be understood the fact that he has no kinship with the whole creation. For there is no comparison between the renown [1] of the Creator and that of the Creature, that of the uncreated and that of the created, that of the nature under the yoke and bondage, and that of him who is made resplendent with imperial honours and is possessed of divine, supra-mundane glory.

11. *And in mentioning the Son, in order that they may not be supposed to be appointing to him a common title which is frequently [1] applied to us also (for we too are called 'sons') they clearly state the means whereby it is possible to see the glory, transcending creation, of the na-

* p. 7

6 [1] "the clear and orthodox symbol of the Faith" - *τὸ ἀκραιφνές τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστέως λσύμβολον* — [2] Om. *ἐπὶ λέξεως*. — [3] "what was written by glorious Peter" - *γεγραφότα ... τὸν παναοίδιμον Πέτρον* — [4] 1 Peter 3:15.

7 [1] Margin adds: "and died"

8 [1] Romans 1:22f.

9 [1] "who is in truth" ... etc. - *δι' ὃν ἐστι πατήρ, συνυφεστῶτός τε καὶ συνυπάρχοντος ἀεί*. — [2] The Syr. here is awkward, if not meaningless. The translator renders literally the *ἀλλά* (= "still/at least"), marking the apodosis to the protasis beginning *εἴπερ οὐ*. ܐܠܐ is not naturally equivalent to *ἀλλά* in this sense. — [3] Om. *καί*. — [4] Om. *καί*. — [5] *λαμπρὰν οὕτω*.

10 [1] *διαφορά*.

11 [1] *ἴσως*.

2 Gk. *ἥλιον*. — [3] Deuteronomy 6:4. — [4] Om. *που*. — [5] Exodus 20:3. — [6] Isaiah 44:6.

tural beauty which he has. For they assert that "he was begotten and not made", and have recognised that he is not naturally on a par with the creation, by virtue of the fact that he was not made. And they forcefully demonstrate that he was begotten, but from God the Father's substance in an incomprehensible, non-temporal manner; for the Word was "in the beginning". And again[1], in indicating appropriately the uniqueness[2] of the parturition (of necessity human terms will be used here) they said that the Son was begotten [as] "God from God". For wherever there is real birth the expectation must also, of course, arise of having to understand and say that the begotten is not alien to the nature of the begetter but belongs to it, seeing that, according to the understanding appropriate and fitting to it, he is from it. For the incorporeal does not beget like a body, but in this fashion rather, like light from light. So that in the light that causes the radiance can be known the light effulgent, which comes from it, in a mysterious and inexplicable issue, and yet stays in it by union and unity of nature. For in this way we declare the Father to be in the Son and the Son in the Father. For the Son in his nature and his glory delineates his begetter. For he also said plainly to a holy disciple of his (Philip was the one): "Do you not believe that I am in my Father and that my Father is in me? He who has seen me has seen the Father. The Father and I are one"[4]. Therefore, the Son is consubstantial with the Father and, in this fashion, we believe[5] true God has been begotten from true God. We find that the word "birth" is applied even to creatures, for example: "I have begotten sons and raised them, but they have acted wickedly against me"[6], * p. 8 — which was spoken by God * concerning the Israel of the flesh[7]. However, the creature gets this sort of appellation in the order of grace, but no term at all of this kind is applied metaphorically to the natural Son and they are all true. And, because of this last fact, he alone out of all said: "I am the truth"[8]. So if one ascribes birth or sonship to him, there is not one false word at all; for he is the truth. Our glorious fathers and initiators into the mysteries[9], then, are keeping our souls secure, by using, throughout, the words "Father", "Son" and "birth", and "true God from true God", and by saying that light caused radiance from light, so that the Birth might have incorporeality and simplicity,

[2] *εἶτα*. — [3] *τὸ γνήσιον*. — [4] John 10:30. — [5] *πιστεύεται*. — [6] Gk. lacks "but they ... me". — [7] "the Israel of the flesh" - *τῶν ἐξ αἵματος Ἰσραήλ*. — [8] Cf. John 14:6. — [9] *μυσταγωγοί*.

the truth of being 'from him' and yet 'in him', in order that each of them may be recognised as existing in his own person. For the Father is the Father and not the Son, and the Son, who has been begotten, is not the Father; and within the self-identity of nature each of them has the property of being what he is.

12. And they have decreed[1] that the Father is "maker of all things visible and invisible" and have declared that the Father created everything through the Son, not allocating him a deficiency in glory as some property which befits him[2], (for how is it possible to perceive inferiority or superiority within the identity of nature?) but inasmuch as God the Father is not wont to make, or summon into existence otherwise than through the Son and the Spirit[3], as through his own Power and Wisdom. For it is written: "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made firm, and all their host by the Spirit of his mouth"[4]. And again wise John, too, in saying: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God", necessarily added: "Everything was made through him, and without him was not a single thing made"[5].

13. Having, then, shown the Son to be consubstantial with the Father, as equal in glory and equal * in creativity with him, they make appro- * p. 9 priate mention of his becoming man and elucidate the mystery of his providential incarnation, rightly considering that in this way[1] the transmission of the Faith would thereby be rendered perfect and complete[2]. For it is not enough for those who believe in him to consider or think only that he is God begotten of God the Father, he who is consubstantial with him and the "image of his hypostasis"[3], but it was necessary to recognize, together with these facts, the fact that he abased himself to the point of 'self-emptying' for the sake of the life and salvation of all; that he took the form of a slave and, born in the flesh of a woman, issued forth as man. For this reason they assert the proposition that "because of us men and because of our salvation he came down, and was incarnate and was made man". Now observe how their statement proceeds with fitting seemliness and in a convenient order. For they declared that "he came down" in order that we might, thereby, attend to him who is above all in nature and glory, and

12 [1] *ἀποφήναντος*. — [2] Om. *πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ*. — [3] *ἐν πνεύματι*. — [4] Psalm 32:6. — [5] John 1:1,3.

13 [1] Gk. lacks "in this way". — [2] *προσοδεύ*. — [3] Hebrews 1:3.

[consider] that it was *he* who came down "because of us", by virtue of the fact that he willed to wear our form and to dawn on the world with the flesh. For it is written in the book of Psalms : "God will come manifestly, our God, and he will not keep silence" [4]. But the descent can also be understood, if one wishes, in a different fashion, as being [a descent] from heaven and from above or from the Father. For the divine Scriptures are wont to use our terms to indicate those things which surpass understanding. For he also said to his holy disciples in conversation with them : "I came forth from the Father and came to the world; and again I leave the world and go unto him who sent me" [5]. And again : "You are from below, I from above" [6]. And again, in addition to these : "I came forth from the Father and have come" [7]. And wondrous[8] John too writes : "He who came from above is above all" [9]. And although he is in exalted heights and in substance above all with his Father, inasmuch as he is crowned with identity of nature with him, "he thought it not robbery to be equal with * God, but emptied himself and took the form of a slave, and was made in the likeness of men and was found in fashion as a man and humbled himself" [10]. For because the Word who is God wore our flesh, he remained even herein God. In this way divine Paul says that God was made in the likeness of men and that he was found in fashion as a man. For, as I have said, God was in our form, and took no unsouled flesh (as certain heretics have seen fit to suppose) but flesh ensouled with a rational soul. Therefore, then, he who came forth from the Father's substance, the Word and Only-begotten Son, very God from very God, light from light, he through whom all things were made — he it is who, as the fathers have declared, "came down" [11] and "was made man", i.e. endured fleshly birth from a woman and came forth in our likeness, for this is "being made man".

* p. 10

14. Therefore the one Lord Jesus Christ, himself the Only-begotten Word of the Father, became man without changing from what he was. For he remained God even in [his] humanity, [he remained] master even in the form of a slave; even in his 'self-emptying' to become like us he possessed his fulness in divine manner; even in the weakness of [his] flesh he was Lord of Hosts; even within the limitations of manhood he had that which transcends the whole creation. For the properties which

[4] Psalm 49:3. — [5] John 16:28. — [6] John 8:23. — [7] John 8:42. — [8] *θεοπέσιος* — [9] John 3:31. — [10] Philippians 2:6-8. — [11] Om. *σαρκωθῆναι*.

belonged to him prior to the flesh, are inseparably his (for he was God, true Only-begotten Son, Light, Life and Power) but those things, which he was not, he is seen to have assumed because of the providential dispensation. For he made his own the properties of the flesh, and they were no other man's properties but, rather, that flesh, which was united with him in an ineffable and incomprehensible manner is his own. In this way too wise John says : "The Word became flesh" [1]. * But he "became flesh" not by being transformed in change, alteration or mutation into the nature of the flesh, nor, again, by intermingling or mixture; nor did he undergo that fusion [2] of natures which some people prate about (for it is impossible, for in nature he is immutable and unalterable) but, rather, he possesses, as I have said, flesh ensouled with a rational soul, [flesh] which he assumed from the spotless, virginal body and made his own. Now divine Scripture is wont on occasions to indicate the whole man with the word 'flesh' alone. For it declares : "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh" [3]. For God did not promise to give the grace of the Spirit to 'fleshes' unsouled with rational soul, but to men who consist of soul and body.

* p. 11

15. Therefore the Word became man without changing from what he is, but manifesting himself in our likeness he remained the Word. And Christ is not thought of as having been a man first and as subsequently [1] having proceeded to become God, but being God [2], he became man, in order that, by this very fact, the same [one] might be thought of as simultaneously God and man. And those who divide him into two sons and venture to assert that God the Word joined himself to a man of the seed of David, gave [3] him the glory, the authority or the honour of sonship and appointed him to endure the cross, to die, to be resurrected, to ascend to heaven and to sit on the right hand of the Father and be worshipped by the whole creation, receiving honour by his elevation to God — these people preach 'two sons' and furthermore they ignorantly pervert the meaning of the mystery. For, as I have said, Christ was not made God out of man, but, being God the Word, he was made flesh i.e. man. And he is said * to have been 'emptied', inasmuch as prior to his self-emptying he possessed in his nature the fulness wherein God is recognized. For he [4] did not, being empty [5],

* p. 12

14 [1] John 1:14. — [2] *συνουσίωσιν*. — [3] Joel 3:1.

15 [1] Om. *οὕτως*. — [2] Om. *ὁ λόγος*. — [3] *μετέδωκεν*. — [4] Om. *τις*. — [5] *ἐκ τοῦ κενὸς εἶναι*.

attain fulness; he abased himself from the divine height and ineffable glory. He was not, being lowly man, gloriously exalted. Free, he bore the form of a slave — not, being a slave, he attained [6] the glory of freedom. He was made in the form of men — he who is in the form of, and in equality with, the Father. He did not, whilst being a man, gain the wealth of coming to be in the form of God by participation.

16. Why, then, do they alter the conditions of the providential dispensation, pervert the truth and oppose all the holy Scriptures which, acknowledging that the Son, who became man, is God, call him 'one' [1] throughout. For even in the book of Genesis Moses wrote as follows: that blessed [2] Jacob took his children across the river Jabbok and remained alone, and a man was contending with him till dawn. And Jacob called the name of that place 'Appearance of God', for he said: "I have seen God face to face and my soul has been saved". And the sun rose when he passed Appearance of God, and Jacob was limping from his thigh [3]. For God revealed beforehand to our prime forefather [4] that at some time his Only-begotten Word would be made man, would have Israel as his adversary and that they would not direct their course towards him aright but would limp; as he said through the Psalmists' [5] harp: "Alien sons have cheated me; alien sons have become old and have limped from their paths" [6]. For this, I think, is what the fact of Jacob's 'limping from his thigh' indicated. However, notice this, that, * p. 13 though a man * was contending with him, he said he had "seen God face to face", and he calls him the 'appearance of God'. For God's Word, even when made man, remained in the form of God [7] the Father, I mean in virtue of his being the quite immutable, intellectual image. For he also said to Philip, showing himself to be, even with the flesh, the image of the Father's substance: "He who has seen me, has seen the Father" [8].

17. And when he healed one blind from his mother's womb and subsequently found him in the Temple, he said to him: "Do you believe in the Son of God?". When the man answered this by saying: "Who is he, Lord, that I may believe in him?", he responded with the words: "You have seen him and the one who is conversing with you is he" [1].

[6] *ἀνεπήδησε.*

16 [1] Om. *τε αὐτόν.* — [2] *θεσπέσιος.* — [3] Cf. Genesis 32:22-24,30f. — [4] "to our prime forefather" - *τῷ πατριάρχῃ* (*τῷ πατρὶ* [*ἐν*] *ἀρχῇ*?). — [5] *τοῦ ψάλλοντος.* — [6] Psalm 17:45f. — [7] Gk. lacks "God". — [8] John 14:9.

17 [1] John 9:35ff.

But the blind man did not see him nakedly [2] or discarnate, but [3] in our form. And he believed in him who was seen, not in some son who was united with a different son, but in one [individual] who is by nature and truly [Son], who dawned, not discarnate, upon the earth [4].

18. And wondrous [1] Moses says in the blessings: "Give to Levi his showings [2] and his truth to the holy man, whom they put to the test at the testing and reviled at the waters of strife, who said to his father and mother: 'I have not seen you', and did not acknowledge his brethren" [3]. For God, who is over all, commanded that Aaron should have a garment [4] interwoven with different colours, and this garment is appropriate to the high priesthood alone and to it was it allocated. Now upon the High Priest's breast were fixed certain gems, twelve in number, and in the middle of them were set knowledge [5] and truth, and two additional different stones. And through these, in figurative manner, was revealed the holy company [6] of the apostles completely * surround- * p. 14 ing Emmanuel — him who is knowledge and truth, for he showed us the truth and set aside the worship which is in shadows and types.

19. How can it be doubted that the Only-begotten Word of God became our High Priest when he was made man? For blessed [1] Paul wrote as follows: "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus, who is faithful to the one who made him" [2]. For the dignity of the priesthood is rightly acknowledged as agreeable to [3] the limitations of humanity. And though it is less than the nature and glory of God the Word, it is yet agreeable to the incarnate dispensation; for his were human properties. "Give", then he says, "to Levi" (i.e. the priest) "knowledge and truth" [4]. And what Levi or priest he is referring to he made plain by saying "the holy man"; for our Lord Jesus Christ committed no sin. But Paul wrote about him: "For a High Priest like this befitted us, one who is holy, without evil and spotless, who is separate from sinners and exalted higher than the heavens" [5]. Him did they "put to the test with testings and reviled him at the waters of strife" [6]. What a surprising thing! He called him a man and at once revealed him as God too, him whom Israel provoked and put to the test in the desert and at the waters of strife. He confirms it by saying in

[2] *γυμνόν.* — [3] Om. *μᾶλλον.* — [4] *τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.*

18 [1] *θεσπέσιος.* — [2] *δήλους*[so LXX = תְּמִיָּה]. — [3] Deuteronomy 33:8f. — [4] *τὸν ποδήρη.* — [5] *δήλωσις.* — [6] *χορός* (Syr. ܟܘܪܣܐ = *τάγμα*).

19 [1] *θεσπεσίου.* — [2] Hebrews 3:1f. — [3] *οὐκ ἀπεοικός ... οὐκ ἀνάρμοστον.* — [4] *Vide supra*, Deuteronomy 33:8. — [5] Hebrews 7:26. — [6] *Vide supra*, Deuteronomy 33:8.

the psalm: "He pierced the rock in the desert and gave them drink as from the mighty deep; he brought out water from the rock and made water run out like rivers." And after this he said: "And they put him to the test in their hearts and murmured against God and said, 'Can God furnish us with tables in the desert, if he struck the rock and water ran out and torrents overflowed; can he also give bread and provide his people with tables?'"[7]. Understand, then, how they reviled
* p. 15 God when he worked wonders, * he whom Moses also called a 'man'. For blessed [8] Paul, by virtue of having understood it thus, wrote: "For they were drinking from the spiritual rock that was with them, and the rock was Christ" [9]. So the 'man' who was reviled was the very one who, not yet incarnate, was put to the test by the Israelites.

20. For Moses has again confirmed by another token that there are not different sons, one prior to the flesh and another, separate from him, of David's seed (as certain persons make bold to assert) but one and the self-same Word, prior to the incarnation as yet unclothed but, after his birth from the holy virgin, incarnate, who [1] was made man, as the holy fathers have written. For like one whom somebody was questioning, wanting to learn what man he had been discoursing of who was 'put to the test' and 'reviled by the Israelites', he, as it were, stretched out his hand so, and showed Jesus, saying: "He who said to his father and to his mother, 'I have not seen you', and did not acknowledge his brethren" [2]. And we recollect how one of the holy evangelists wrote that once, when Christ was instructing and initiating certain folk, his mother came and his brethren, and one of his disciples ran and said: " 'Behold, your mother and your brethren are standing outside and want to see you', he stretched out his hand towards his disciples, saying: 'My mother and my brethren are they who hear the word of God and do it. For he who does the will of my Father in heaven, this one is my brother, my sister and my mother" [3]. This is, I think, what Moses meant by: "He who said to his father and his mother, 'I have not seen you', and did not acknowledge his brethren" [4].

21. Thus again wise Daniel too said that he saw the Only-begotten Word of God in our likeness. For he declared that he saw the Ancient of Days seated upon a throne and ten thousand times ten thousand

[7] Psalm 77: 15f, 18f. — [8] *θεσπέσιος*. — [9] 1 Corinthians 10:4.

20 [1] *καὶ*. — [2] *Vide supra*, Deuteronomy 33:9. — [3] Luke 8:20f; Matthew 12:46f. — [4] *Vide supra*, Deuteronomy 33:9.

* standing and thousands of thousands ministering. And, after inserting other particulars, he afterwards goes on: "I was seeing in a vision of the night, and, behold, upon the clouds of heaven there comes one like the Son of Man. And he reached the Ancient of Days and was brought near before him; and to him was given honour and rule, and all nations and tongues shall worship him" [1]. Behold again, he clearly and plainly saw Emmanuel ascending to God the Father in heaven. For the cloud received him — him whom he called not simply 'a man', but 'like the Son of Man' [2]; for he was God the Word who was made in our likeness. In the same way understand also wise Paul, and he said that he was made in the form of men, was found in fashion as a man and was seen in the likeness of man's flesh [3] by those on earth [4]. But if he was a man, who, by connexion with God was honoured like God, the prophet would have said that he saw one 'like God' or 'like the Son of God' coming with the clouds. Yet he did *not* say this, but 'like the Son of Man'. He acknowledges the Son, therefore, as being God and as him who was made man [5] and, in Paul's language, 'was made in the likeness of man'[6]. Nevertheless, even as revealed in flesh he "reached the Ancient of Days" (i.e. he returned to the throne of his Father) "and to him was given honour and rule, and all the nations and tongues worship him." [7] And this is what was said by him: "Father, glorify me with the glory I had with thee before the world was made" [8].

* p. 16

22. For wise Paul shows that the Word of God, after he was incarnate, is even with the flesh, co-regent with, and equal in glory to, God the Father, (inasmuch as he is one Son even when made * man) by writing: "For we have this sort of High Priest, one who sits on the right hand of the throne of majesty in the heights" [1]. And again, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, when the Jews were asking him if he were truly the Christ, said: "If I tell you, you will not believe and, if I ask you, you will return me no answer. From now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of God's power" [2]. Therefore the company of the holy prophets saw the Son on the throne of the Godhead even after he was made man.

* p. 17

21 [1] Daniel 7:9f, 13f. — [2] *ἄνθρωπον ... υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου* (the same in Aramaic, viz. ܒܪ ܐܢܫ). — [3] Syr. om. *ἁμαρτίας*. — [4] Cf. Philippians 2:7 (*vide supra*, § 13); cf. Baruch, 3:37. — [5] *ἢ γοῦν*. — [6] Cf. Philippians 2:7. — [7] *Vide supra*, Daniel 7:13. — [8] John 17:5.

22 [1] Hebrews 8:1. — [2] Luke 22:67ff.

23. But let us examine also the heralds of the new Covenant who spoke mysteries under heaven [1], those to whom Christ himself said: "It is not you who are speaking, but the Spirit of your Father speaks in you" [2]. So we find that the blessed Baptist said: "After me comes the man who was before me, because he is prior to me" [3]. But how can he who 'comes after' him have been 'prior' to him? For it is plain to everyone that Christ is after John in terms of bodily life-span. What then is one to say with regard to these matters? Our Saviour himself resolved the question, for he said, speaking to the Jews: "Verily I say to you, before Abraham was I am" [4]. For he was 'before' Abraham in divine manner, but he is thought of as 'after' him in respect of his having become [5] man. And when God the Father openly proclaims: "I will not give my glory to any other" [6] (for there is no God except him, not even one) Christ said to us: "When the Son of man comes in the glory of his father with the holy angels" [7]. Again wise Paul has written that the Son of man was expected to descend from heaven: "For the saving grace of God has been revealed to all men, instructing us [8] to deny evil * and the world's lusts, and to live in this world purely, justly and piously, awaiting the blessed hope and the revelation of the great God and our saviour Jesus Christ" [9]. And he also said in another passage, when setting forth an account about the Israel of the flesh: "Theirs are the promises, the giving of the Law and the covenant, and from them is Christ in the flesh, he who is God over all, blessed for ever. Amen" [10].

* p. 18

24. Therefore, following unswervingly the footsteps of the fathers' confession, we declare of him that he, who was begotten from God the Father, the Only-begotten Son, was incarnate, was made man, suffered, died and rose on the third day from the dead. For we acknowledge that the Word of God is impassible by his nature and no one is so mad as to suppose that the nature, which transcends all, can admit of suffering. But because he became man and appropriated flesh from the holy Virgin, we affirm, following herein the conditions of the providential dispensation, that he who, as God, is exalted above suffering, suffered humanly in his flesh. For if, whilst being God, he became man, without changing from his being God; and if, whilst becoming a part of creation, he remained above creation; and if, whilst being, as God, the giver of the Law, he became under the Law and was [1] giving the Law; and if, whilst being, divinely, Lord, he assumed the form of a slave and possessed inseparably the dignity of Lordship; and if, whilst being the Only-begotten, he became the first-born amongst many brethren even whilst being the Only-begotten; what wonder is it if, whilst suffering humanly in the flesh, he is recognized thus also as divinely impassible?

23 [1] "who spoke mysteries under heaven" - [κήρυκας] [τοὺς] τῆς [ὑφ'] ἡλίου μυσταγωγούς. — [2] Matthew 10:20. — [3] John 1:30. — [4] John 8:58. — [5] πέφηνεν. — [6] Isaiah 42:8. — [7] Mark 8:38. — [8] "instructing us" - Syr. adds ܠ ܡܠܦܢ = παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς [see Titus 2:11]. — [9] Titus 2:11f. — [10] Romans 9:4f.

25. For all-wise Paul also asserts of the self-same Word, * who is in the form of, and on a par with, the Father [1], that "he became obedient even unto death, the death of the cross" [2]. And in another of his letters he says of him: "He who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, because in him was everything made [3]; and he is before all, and in him everything has been established" [4]. And he said that "he has been given to the Church as head and to be made the first-fruits of them that slept and the first-born of the dead" [5]. How could the Word from God the Father, being Life and Life-giving, inasmuch as he sprang forth from the Life of his begetter, have been 'the first-born of the dead' and the 'first-fruits of them that slept'? For because he appropriated that flesh which was receptive of death, by the grace of God, as all-wise Paul said, he tasted death, on behalf of everyone [6], in that flesh which was able to endure death, [and yet] without changing [7] from his being Life. Therefore, even though he is declared to have suffered in the flesh, he did not receive the fact of suffering in the nature of the Godhead but, as I have just said, in that flesh of his which was receptive of sufferings [8].

* p. 19

26. For blessed Isaiah the prophet also, recognizing him who suffered in the flesh as God made man, said in one passage of him: "He was led like a sheep to the slaughter and like a lamb before its shearer he was silent. So he did not open his mouth in his humiliation; his judgement was taken away and his generation who shall recount? Because his life is taken away from the earth" [1]. Now [2] if there was a man, separately acknowledged as son, who was united with God (as the teachers of im-

24 [1] Om. ἔτι.

25 [1] Om. θεοῦ καί. — [2] Philippians 2:8. — [3] Om. τὰ πάντα ... γῆς. — [4] Colossians 1:15ff. — [5] Cf. *ibid*, v. 18; 1 Corinthians 15:20. — [6] Cf. Hebrews 2:9. — [7] ἀνοβλαβῶν. — [8] τοῦ πάθους.

26 [1] Isaiah 53:7f. — [2] καίτοι.

pious doctrines assert) how could it have been hard to find him who could 'recount his generation'? For he was made of the seed of Jesse
* p. 20 * and of David, but the birth of God the Word, or the manner of [his] birth, who is able to declare? For his life (i.e. his substance, for he has put 'life' instead of 'substance') is taken away from the earth, flies in the height and sweeps [3] over all things on earth; for not to be known by, and not to be comprehended by, the minds of men is the account of the ineffable nature.

27. Now I further add to what has been said, this: "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism" [1], as holy Paul said. There being, then, one Lord, one faith and one baptism, who is the Lord and whom have we believed in and been baptised into? But perhaps someone may say that Lordship, faith [2] and saving baptism fulfilled in him are specially appropriate to the Word from God the Father. For thus he charged the holy apostles, saying: "Go, make disciples of all nations and baptise them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost" [3].

And blessed [4] Paul clearly displays the glory of the Lordship, the confession of the faith and the power of holy baptism, when he says: "Say not in your heart 'who shall ascend into heaven?' (that is to say, bring Christ down) or 'who shall descend into the deep?' (that is to say, bring up Christ from the dead) but what did Scripture say? 'The Word is near you, your mouth and your heart' — because if you say with your mouth [5], 'Jesus is Lord' and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you shall be saved" [6]. And again he writes: "Do you not know that we who have been baptized into Jesus Christ [7] have been baptized into his death?" [8] See therefore [how] he has accurately and skilfully defined the confession of the Lordship, the faith and grace of holy baptism with regard to him who endured death and rose from the dead.

* p. 21 **28**. Do we then verily [1] believe in two sons, are we by-passing [2] * the Word, who shone forth from God the Father, and [are we] attaching the glory of Lordship, the confession of faith and heavenly baptism

[3] *ὑπερνήχεται*.

27 [1] Ephesians 4:5. — 2 Om. *τὴν πρὸς ἡμῶν*. — [3] Matthew 28:19. — [4] *θεσπέσιος*. — [5] "with your mouth" - Syr. adds ܒܦܘܡܟ = *ἐν τῷ στόματί σου*. Scribal reminiscence (?) Cyril's quotation here is not exact. Cf. § 23, note 8 [see Romans 10:9]. — [6] Romans 10:6 ff. — [7] *Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*. — [8] Romans 6:3.

28 [1] Gk. lacks "verily". — [2] *παραδραμόντες*. (but see Syriac text and note).

to a different, separate son, who suffered? How can it fail to be folly, meaning [3] undoubtedly wickedness, to think or speak thus? What, then do we say? The Lord is really one, the faith is one and [there is] one baptism. For there is also one Son and Lord, and the Word did not assume a man by association nor reveal him as partaker of his dignities nor give him sonship or Lordship (as certain persons have foolishly spoken and written) but the self-same Word of God, Light from Light, was made man and became incarnate. Into his death were we baptised, his who suffered humanly in his flesh but remained divinely impassible and is alive for ever; for his is Life from God the Father's life. In this way, death, which made bold to assault the body of Life, has been conquered; in this way, corruption is nullified in us too and the power of death loses its strength. For Christ also said: "Verily, verily I say to you, that unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood you have no life in yourselves" [4]. The holy body and the blood of Christ, then, is life-giving. For, as I have said, the body is not that of a man who participates in life, but rather of him who is, by his nature, Life, meaning the Only-begotten.

29. The Christ-loving company [1] of the holy fathers thinks this along with us, as well as the one who presently adorns the throne of the holy church of Constantinople, our holy and pious brother and fellow-bishop, Proclus. For he too wrote to the pious bishops of the Orient in these words, as follows: "The immutably * eternal [2] is incarnate and * p. 22 the unbeginning is born in the flesh. The one who is perfect in nature was advancing in bodily age and he who transcends suffering accepts suffering, not enduring insult by virtue of what he is, but he accepted the sufferings of the body by virtue of what he became." Thus the wrongness of belief on the part of those who have thought or written differently is shown up as possessed throughout of an impure disease, which is out of harmony with the doctrine of the truth.

30. The blessed [1] fathers then, having completed the account of Christ, mention the Holy Ghost. For they spoke of "believing in" him, just as also in the Father and the Son. For he is consubstantial with them and flows (i.e. issues) as it were from the fount of God the Father and is bestowed on creation through the Son. For he breathed on the holy

[3] *μᾶλλον δὲ*. — [4] John 6:53.

29 [1] *χορός* (Syr. ܟܘܪܣܐ = *τάγμα*). — [2] *ἀνείδεος* ("formless") - reading *ἄϊδιος*, *ἀείδιος*.

30 [1] *τρισμακάριοι*.

Apostles, saying: "Receive the Holy Ghost" [2]. Therefore, the Spirit is from God and is God, and is not alien to the all-transcending essence but from it, in it and belonging to it.

31. This, then, is the orthodox and inerrant faith (i.e. profession of faith) of the holy fathers. But, as Paul says: "The God of this world [5] has blinded the understandings of the unbelievers, so that the light of the glory of Christ's gospel [1] should not illumine them." [2] For certain persons have left off following directly after the truth and have veered astray [3], 'not considering what they are saying or what they are contending over' [4]. For having confined the glory of sonship to the Word alone, who shone forth from the Father [5], they assert that, as it were a son different from this one, [a son] of the seed of Jesse and David, has been joined to him and made partaker in the sonship, God-befitting dignity and indwelling of the Word, and that he gets everything * from him having nothing at all of his own. Concerning these people, I think, our Saviour's disciples wrote: "Wicked men have entered, people who of old are previously written down for this judgement, who have changed the grace of God into impurity and have denied him who is the sole Lord, our Lord Jesus Christ" [6]. But Jesus Christ is rightly called the Word who was revealed in human form. However [7], let the opposition (who do not decline thinking and talking with great ignorance like Nestorius and Theodore) be asked to explain to us: Do you refuse to allow him, who is from the holy Virgin, his being God and true Son of God the Father, and are you allocating the fact of suffering to him on his own by removing him [8] from God the Word, with the aim that God should not be called 'passible'! For these are the discoveries and mental considerations of those who are supposed to be canny [9]. Therefore, let not the Word from God the Father be named "Christ" on his own and by himself. For just as the fact that he suffered does not adhere to him when he is acknowledged apart from the flesh, so also the anointing is a matter which is alien to, and does not attach to, him. For God anointed with the Holy Ghost Jesus from

* p. 23

[2] John 20:22.

31 [1] "light ... gospel" - Syr. *sic.*; *τῶν φωτισμῶν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης.* — [2] 2 Corinthians 4:4. — [3] "veered astray" - *ἐξέπεσον κατὰ πετρῶν.* — [4] 1 Timothy 1:7. — [5] Om. *θεοῦ.* — [6] Jude 4. — [7] *ἀτεί.* — [8] So the Syr. MS apparently; a diacritical point added would give "it" i.e. the fact of suffering (see Syr. text and note). — [9] "For these ... to be canny" - Syr. freely renders here *ταῦτα γὰρ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀθλιοφρόνως τὰ εὑρήματα καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐκεῖσε χρῆσις.*

Nazareth, but the Word from God is in every respect perfect [10] and has no need of anointing through the Holy Ghost. Therefore, deny the divine plan and banish the Only-begotten from love for the World! Let not Christ be named by you! Or is not his coming to be within our limitations disesteemed [11] by him? Therefore, seeing that this fact too is out of harmony with him, let no one acknowledge that he came to be amongst men [12], so that Christ may tell them also: "You are in error, because you are ignorant of the Scriptures and of God's power" [13]. Therefore, accounting as enemies of the truth those who are minded to think * thus, let us avoid their novel [14] and destructive expressions. But let us follow rather the mind of the holy fathers and the tradition of the holy Apostles and Evangelists. For the Word who became man was himself the one who was speaking in them; through Whom and with Whom be honour, glory and might to God the Father, with the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen.

* p. 24

HERE ENDS THE DISCOURSE OF BLESSED CYRIL ON THE FAITH.

[10] *αὐτοτελής.* — [11] *ἐμικρόν.* — [12] *ὅτι γέγονεν ἀνθρωπος.* — [13] Matthew 22:29. — [14] *κενοφωνίας*; Syr. clearly read *καινοφωνίας.*

II

* *AGAIN* THE LETTER OF BLESSED CYRIL TO ACACIUS, BISHOP OF MELITENE

* p. 25

1. To my lord, brother and dearly beloved [1] fellow-minister, Mar [2] Acacius — Cyril sends greetings in our Lord.

The exchange of greetings [3] is a thing convenient to brethren, for it is sweet and admirable and more prized than all else by those who view the truth aright [4]. And this exchange of greetings ought to take place [5] constantly with brethren and fellow-believers, being in nothing restrained or hindered by him [6] who is fervent in this same desire. But if it chances that this thing is hindered by the extent of the journey, when it does come about for us, we take this matter as a God-send and receive it with joy [7]. Now because I was delighted at the things which were written [8] to me by your Paternity and marvelled at your affection, I was at pains [9] to write and inform you of how the peace of the churches has been effected and how each particular thing has been brought about.

2. The pious Emperor was filled with much diligence with regard to the peace of the church, and the schism which was in it lay heavy upon him [1]; and, for this reason, he sent for the pious bishop Maximian of Constantinople and the rest of the bishops who were to be found there. He was deliberating with them as to how the schism should be

* p. 26

removed from our midst and the priests of God's mysteries * should draw near [2] to peace. And they were saying that this could not happen and that it was impossible for those who were the objects of this discussion to agree in love, unless harmony in the faith first dawned upon them. And they were saying that pious John, Bishop of Antioch, ought to anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius in a document and to subscribe his deposition and, furthermore, that Bishop Cyril of Alexandria should, for charity's sake, forget his injury and overlook the insult done him at Ephesus [3].

3. And after the faithful Emperor had agreed to these things and rejoiced at them, the honourable and admirable tribune Aristolaus was sent to accomplish this very thing. And after the Emperor's command had been shown to the Orientals and it had been made known that this command was issued by the design of the bishops who were assembled at Constantinople, Orientals too happened to be with [1] the pious Mar Acacius, Bishop of the city of Aleppo [2], and made him write to me to the effect that peace could not be brought about in any other way but by accordance with what they were requesting [3]. But this demand lay heavy and severe upon me. For they were wanting all that had been written by me in letters, tomes and books to be made null and void and us all to adhere only to the faith laid down by our holy fathers at Nicaea. And in answer to this, I wrote that we all do follow the Faith which was laid down by our holy fathers at the city of Nicaea, without diminishing it in any respect (because it was laid down aright and no one can bring discredit on it) and as for the things I wrote against the blasphemies of Nestorius, no one will persuade me to declare that I did not do well to compose them. But they ought (in accordance with what had seemed good to the pious Emperor and also to the holy synod which assembled at Ephesus) to anathematize the one * who is fighting against our Saviour's glory, to deny his blasphemies, * p. 27

to acknowledge his deposition and to consent to blessed Maximian's ordination to the episcopate.

4. And after they had received this document from me, they sent the honourable and pious Paul, Bishop of Homs to me. There were many lengthy discussions with him with regard to what had been said and performed cruelly and unlawfully at Ephesus. But because we ought to forget these things and ought to be diligent in doing what is necessary, I was asking him whether he had on him any document from the holy bishop John. And afterwards he gave me a letter not containing what it ought to have contained; it was not expressed in the requisite manner, for in it lay the import of provocation not of persuasion. And I therefore paid no attention to it, for they ought to have apolo-

1 [1] *Or* "own beloved" = lit. "beloved of my soul/self", *ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ*. — [2] Gk. lacks "Mar" (= *κύριος*). — [3] "The exchange of greetings" = lit. "the recompense of returning greetings". — [4] *τοῖς ἀρτίφροσιν ἀληθῶς*. — [5] Syr. read *ἐπιγένεσθαι* instead of *ἐπείγεσθαι* (?). — [6] Syr. construction is awkward here (cf. note no. 2 to Text) representing a free rendering of original. — [7] A free Syr. rendering of the whole section, omitting *καὶ οὐχ ἑκοῦσιν ἡμῖν ἢ τῶν τοῦ γράμματος διακομιστῶν ἢ σπάνις*. — [8] *τοῖς ἐπεσταλμένοις*. — [9] *δεῖν ὑφήθην*.

2 [1] "and the schism ... him" - Syr. compresses. — [2] *κεκλήσονται*.

[3] *καίτοι παγχάλεπον τε καὶ δύσοιστον ὄν*.

3 [1] *συνήχθησαν*; om. *οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι σκοπήσαντες*. — [2] *τῆς Βερεαίων*. — [3] *κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῖς δοκοῦν*.

gized and assuaged my injury in respect of what had been done to me on their part at Ephesus. By way of excuse they were saying: "We have been embittered against you by zeal for holy doctrine". I said to them [1]: "It was not zeal which roused you against me, nor did you band together to fight me for the sake of true doctrine, but you consented to the blandishments of men and curried favour with [2] persons in authority at that time". After the pious bishop Paul had told me that he readily anathematized Nestorius's blasphemies and acknowledged his deposition in writing, he said this: that "he acted on behalf of all the oriental bishops and that the parchment given by him suffices for him to prove that his communicating with us is on behalf of the Orientals" — after this I told him: "Let John, Bishop of Antioch, produce for us the document requisite for all these matters" [3].

* p. 28 This too was done * and there came to an end the controversy between the two sides and from that time on there was no division amongst us [4].

5. It was clear thereafter in every way that those who were standing on Nestorius's side were brought to nought by the peace of the church. And something of this sort seems to me to have befallen them, something which usually befalls those who have no experience in swimming and who fall unintentionally out of a boat. When they are nigh on drowning, the miserable creatures throw out their hands and their feet this way and that and take hold, in a disorderly manner, of anything which they happen to meet with, doing it out of love of their lives. Or is it not truly said about them that they are terrified because they have fallen, being left on their own and set apart from their churches which they thought were their aids? Or do they not consider [1] that many are fleeing from them and looking upon them as deceivers? And these are turning to the way of truth [2] because they feel that they have intoxicated them with the verbal novelties of their error? One might appropriately apply to them the Prophet's saying: "Be gathered and bound together, O ignorant people, before you become like grass which passes away" [3]. Why have they eaten one another's vomit and are not ashamed that they have fouled their hearts

4 [1] ἤκουον; Syr. changes to *oratio recta*. — [2] Lit. "snatched to yourselves the love of". — [3] Syr. changes to *oratio recta* and simplifies considerably here by omission without damage to the sense. — [4] Syr. simplifies.

5 [1] Perh. = "are they not injured"; cf. Aphel = "injure/offend". Gk. ἀσχάλλουσι. — [2] "turning ... truth". ἀνανήφοντας εἰς ἀλήθειαν. Syr. simplifies the whole sentence. — [3] Zephaniah 2:1.

with one another's filth? "Hear, you deaf and see, you blind! Consider the Lord in truth and seek him with a simple heart" [4]. For why do you seek intricate inventions and tortuous reasonings? Why do you abuse the straight road and pervert your paths? "Break up your fallows and do not sow on thorns" [5].

6. For being grieved, as I have said, on account of the peace which has come to pass in the churches, they are cunningly blaming those who do not adhere to them and are bitterly condemning the defence of the oriental bishops. They are tugging at it to make it what they want and find dear, without rightly considering * it. They are saying: "None of * p. 29 Nestorius's inventions is altered". And they are even accusing us falsely of having, as they say, acted [1] contrary to what we wrote. Now I learn that they are saying this too: that we have, as they say, accepted [2] a new Symbol of the Faith, the ancient, venerable one having been rejected by us. "The fool speaks folly, and his heart thinks vanity" [3]. But we say this: that no Symbol of the Faith has been required of us nor have we accepted from anyone what has been newly said [4]. For the divine Scripture is enough for us and that sound understanding of our fathers' faith which is absolutely orthodox and complete.

7. But because the oriental bishops at Ephesus were divided from us and were thought by us to have fallen into the blasphemies of Nestorius, they, therefore, have very prudently (as men who are at pains to rid themselves of this aspersion and this supposition) produced a defence which deserves no reproach or blame [1]. Indeed, if Nestorius himself, at the time when he was asked by us, had wanted to reject his doctrine and to accept the truth in a written confession, would it have been considered in his case that he had produced a fresh Faith? Why, then, do they revile us and give the empty name of "a new Faith" to the harmony of bishops achieved by us [2] through the defence which those who were not of Nestorius's doctrine produced and restored? [3] For the holy Synod, which assembled at the city of Ephesus, considered that no other Faith should be laid down than the one which our fathers laid down by the Holy Spirit at the city of Nicaea.

4 Wisdom of Solomon 1:1. — [5] Jeremiah 4:3.

6 [1] πεφρονηκότας. — [2] Om. ἀρτίως. — [3] Isaiah 32:6. — [4] *Or* "nor have we accepted what has newly been said by anyone".

7 [1] Syr. simplifies considerably. — [2] Om. κατὰ τὴν Φουίκην. — [3] So the Syr. punctuates.

But they, who at one time were somehow or other divided over it and were thought not to be believing aright and not to be following the Scriptures of the Gospels and the apostles — did they rid themselves of this disgrace by keeping silence or by defending themselves, proving and revealing the strength of their faith? For this is what the
* p. 30 * glorious disciple wrote: "Be ready to make your defence to everyone who asks you the reason for the hope of your faith" [4]. And behold the one who is keen not to compose any novelty is also seen to show [5] that he is not producing a new Symbol of the Faith, but professes the faith he has about Christ to those who ask him.

8. And along with these things, I have learned, that, on account of the mutual harmony which has been achieved by the bishops, the enemies of the truth have been grieved in no small measure and are jumbling everything up [1] and saying that the document [2] which was produced by the bishops is in harmony with their impious inventions, that document which has in it the import of the true faith and harmonizes with, and adheres in every particular to, that of our fathers. But in order that we may prove that they are liars, let us bring into our midst Nestorius's clamour and the statements of these people. For this investigation can demonstrate the truth.

9. Therefore, Nestorius is seen [1] to be utterly uprooting the corporeal birth of God, for he denies that he was born of a woman as the Scriptures say he was. For he said as follows: "I have learned from the Scriptures that God *issued* from the Virgin Mother of Christ, but that God was *born* from her I have nowhere learned". And in another exposition [2] he said: "Nowhere has the Scripture said that *God* was born of the Virgin Mother of Christ, but 'Jesus', 'Christ', 'the Son' and 'the Lord' ". But how can anyone doubt that he, who says these things, is dividing the Son into two sons; and one, he says, is separately Son, Christ and Lord (he who is the Word, who was begotten from God the Father) but another besides is separately [3] Son, Christ and Lord (he who was born of the Holy Virgin) — how can anyone doubt it for he preaches [4] it openly?

[4] 1 Peter 3:15. — [5] See note no. 2 to Text (p. 30).

8 [1] Lit. "up and down". *ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω διακυκῶσι.* — [2] *ὁμολογίας*; Syr. simplifies the whole sentence.

9 [1] *εὑρίσκεται.* — [2] *ἐξηγήσει* [= (almost) "sermon"]. — [3] Om. *ἀνὰ μέρος.* — [4] *βοᾶται*; Syr. simplifies here.

10. But those who call the * Holy Virgin, "Mother of God", also say * p. 31 that the Son, Christ and Lord is one, complete in his Godhead and complete in his manhood because his body is [1] with a rational soul. For from the things that they subsequently said it is apparent to everybody that they are not saying that there is one Son, who was begotten of God the Father, and another who was born of the Virgin (as it seemed fit to Nestorius) but that he is one and the same Son. For they add that he who is perfect as God is perfect as Man; he, who was begotten in his Godhead from the Father before the times, the same was, in the last days, for our sake and for our salvation, born in his manhood of the Holy Virgin Mary, consubstantial with the Father in his Godhead and consubstantial with us in his manhood. Therefore, they do not divide the one Son, Christ and Lord Jesus into two, but say that the same was both before the worlds and in the last times i.e. he who is from the Father as God and from a woman, in the flesh, as Man.

11. For how could he be conceived of by us as consubstantial with us in his manhood, although begotten of the Father in his Godhead, unless he were conceived of, and said to be, the same, God and Man together? But this is not how he is thought of by Nestorius, but Nestorius has changed his whole view to something quite opposite. For in expounding [1] the matter in church, he said: "For this reason Christ the Word is called 'God' [2] because he has continual association with God". And again: "Let us preserve the association of the natures without confusion; let us acknowledge God who is in the Man; let us revere him who is worshipped in glorious association with the Omnipotent God and who is Man". You see how full of absurdity * and blasphemy the * p. 32 statement is. For he said that Christ is named "God the Word" because he had association with God [3]. Does he not, then, clearly say "two Christs"? How is he not acknowledging a man who is worshipped along with God? These statements of Nestorius's do not correspond with theirs [4] for he plainly says "two" but they acknowledge and worship one Christ, one Son, one God and Lord, the same, from the Father in his Godhead and from the Virgin in his manhood. And they say

10 [1] So Syr. See note no. 1 to Text (p. 31).

11 [1] *ἐξηγούμενος*; *vide supra* note no. 2 (p. 24). — [2] Syr. here apparently in disorder. Gk. *διὰ τοῦτο Χριστὸς ὁ θεὸς λόγος ὀνομάζεται ἐπειδήπερ ἔχει τὴν συνάφειαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν διηνεκῆ.* (cf. note no. 1 to Text, p. 31). — [3] So Syr; Gk. *Χριστὸν μὲν γὰρ ἔλεγεν ὀνομάσθαι φησὶ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, ἔχειν δὲ τὴν συνάφειαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν διηνεκῆ.* — [4] Syr. omits a clause and paraphrases here.

that the union came into being from two natures, but they acknowledge one Christ, one Son and one Lord. For "the Word became flesh" [5] as it is written. And we truly confess that an ineffable union by divine dispensation was effected from mutually dissimilar things, which formed an inseparable unity [6].

12. For we do not think like certain ancient heretics, who say that God the Word took of the nature of his Godhead and fashioned a body for himself, but, adhering, in every way, to the divine Scriptures, we confess that he took it from the Virgin. And thereby, accepting theoretically [1] the one unique Son and Lord Jesus Christ as being from these things, we speak of two natures which came into union. After the union, inasmuch as that which divides them into two is eradicated, we confess that there is one nature of the Son as being one, who, however, became man and was incarnate. For if he is said to have become incarnate and been made man, whilst being God the Word, let us not envisage any alteration in respect of him (for he remained as he was) but let an unconfused union be acknowledged by us.

13. But perhaps those, who are against us, may say this: "Behold, plainly those who confess the orthodox faith name 'two natures' but they say that they divide the divine expressions according to the distinc-
* p. 33 tion contained therein. And how * are these statements not contradictory to yours? For you will not consent to dividing out the expressions to two persons or hypostases". But, my friends, we say we wrote in those chapters: "Anyone who divides out the expressions to persons or hypostases and attaches some of them to the Man, conceived of separately apart from God the Word, and some of them as pertaining to God only, who was begotten from the Father — let this man be condemned". And we do not at any time eradicate the difference between the expressions, although we have rejected dividing them out separately to the Son [1] who is from the Father, and again separately to the Man who is from a woman and is conceived of as Son. For, as we are persuaded, the nature of God the Word is one, God the Word who was both incarnate and made man, as I have previously said.

14. Now if anyone investigates the manner in which he was incarnate and was made man, he will see that God the Word from God "took the

[5] John 1:14. — [6] ἕνωσιν.

12 [1] Lit. "as in the mind". ὡς ἐν ἐννοίᾳ.

13 [1] Om. τῷ λογῷ.

likeness of a slave and was made in the likeness of man"[1], as it is written. And only in this way is the difference of natures or hypostases conceived of. For the divine nature and the human are not conceived of as comprised in the same natural rules [2]. But how was God the Word emptied out by abasing himself amongst things inferior i.e. those things of ours? So when the manner of the incarnation is investigated, the human mind observes those things mutually joined in an ineffable union without alteration [3] or intermingling. After they have become one, the mind does not divide them at all, but believes, and truly accepts, that there is one God, Son, Christ and Lord who is from both of them.

15. But the wickedness of Nestorius's belief is different from this. For he pretends to acknowledge that God the Word was incarnate and made man. Because he does not know the import * of the incarnation, * p. 34 he names "two natures", separating them from one another and putting God on one side by himself and the Man, who is joined to [1] God only in love, honour and authority, on the other side by himself. For he said as follows: "God is not separated from the one who is seen; therefore I do not separate the honour of him who is undivided. I separate the natures but I unite the worship". But our Antiochene brethren, who have accepted only in idea [2] the things whereby Christ is known and have talked of a difference of natures (because, as I have said, manhood and Godhead are not in the same order of nature) speak of one Son, Christ and Lord (inasmuch as he is truly one) one person. And they in no way divide what are one, nor, again, do they accept a separation in the natures, as the teacher of wretched novel inventions has supposed.

16. But they said that it is only right for the expressions uttered by [1] our Lord to be distinguished. They do not attribute some of them, as it were, to that Son, who is the Word from the Father, and some of them to a different Son, who was born of a woman, but some of them to his Godhead and some of them to his manhood (for the same is God and Man) and they say that other expressions are jointly applied to both his Godhead and his manhood, as I too say. For there are expressions which befit his Godhead and expressions which befit his manhood

14 [1] Philippians 2:7. — [2] κοιότητι φυσικῇ. — [3] Gk. lacks "without alteration".

15 [1] Om. σχετικῶς. — [2] "only in idea". οὐκ ἐν φαλαῖς καὶ μόναις ἐννοίαις.

16 [1] "by" *or* (more awkwardly) "with regard to". ἐπί.

and there are others, having a midway position, which indicate the Son who is at once God and Man. For when he says to Philip: "All this time I have been with you and you did not know me, Philip? Do you not believe that I am in my Father and my Father in me? He who has seen me has seen the Father. The Father and I are one" [2]. We say
* p. 35 that this * befits the Godhead. But when he rebukes the Jewish People, saying: "If you were the children of Abraham you would be doing the deeds of Abraham, but now you are seeking to kill me, a man who has spoken the truth to you; and this Abraham did not do" [3]. We say that these things are spoken in human fashion, nevertheless, the divine and human expressions are the one Son's. For being God, he became Man, without abandoning his being God but being made man by the assumption of flesh and blood. Since he is one Son, God and Lord, we and they say of him that he is one person.

17. And these expressions are in a midway position such as when blessed Paul wrote: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today and for ever" [1]. And again: "For although there are many gods and many lords in heaven and earth, yet to us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things and we from him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through him" [2]. And again:: "I was praying that I myself might be anathema from Christ for the sake of my brethren and kinsfolk in the flesh, who are Israelites; whose was the adoption, the law, the covenant, the promises [3] and the fathers, and from them Christ has appeared in the flesh, who is God over all to whom be praises for ever ond ever. Amen" [4]. For behold he has said of Jesus Christ that he is [5] "yesterday, today and for ever" and that "all things are made through him", and him, who is from the Jews in the flesh, he names "God over all" and furthermore says that he is "blessed for ever". Therefore, do not separate these expressions in respect of our Lord, for they are at once divine ond human and they befit the [6] Son i.e. God the Word, who became incarnate. It is one thing then for a man to divide the natures after the union and to
* p. 36 say that the Man was joined to God only * in honour, and another thing to acknowledge the difference in the expressions.

[2] John 14:9-10; 10:30. — [3] John 8:39-40.

17 [1] Hebrews 13:8. — [2] 1 Corinthians 8:5-6. — [3] Gk. lacks "promises". The translator recalls the Peshitta (?). — [4] Romans 9:3-5. — [5] Om. "the same". *τὸν αὐτόν*. — [6] Om. *ἑνί*.

18. Where, then, do these opinions of theirs coincide with the novel wickedness of Nestorius? For it is not to be wondered at, even if the verbal expression and sound of the words is thought by some to be wanting in subtle accuracy. For statements about these things are difficult, and, therefore, blessed Paul also was seeking a word from God to open his mouth [1]. But it is clear to everybody that they are not dividing the [2] Lord Jesus Christ into two by saying that the divine expressions befit his Godhead and the human ones his manhood. For they are affirming, as I have said, that he, who is God the Word from the Father [3], who was begotten before the worlds, the same was begotten, in the flesh, in the last days from the Holy Virgin. And they also add, on account of the unconfused and ineffable union, that they believe the Holy Virgin to be Mother of God. And they clearly confess one Son, one Christ and Lord. And it is utterly unlikely that they would speak of one and divide the one into two, for they have not reached such a pitch of madness with respect to what they had affirmed [4]. For if they agree with the teaching of Nestorius, why do they anathematize it and censure it?

19. I shall endeavour to say for what reason they arrived at these feeble statements [1]. Because the aids of Arius's impiety were wickedly perverting the import of the truth and saying that God [2] from the Father became man, but say that he was anointed [3] in a soulless body (and they are introducing this idea cunningly in order that they may fasten the human expressions to him and abase him from his Father) for this reason, the Orientals were afraid that the glory of the Father's Son * would diminish, because human statements are predicated of him * p. 37
on account of his incarnate dispensation [4]. They divided the expressions, without dividing the one Son and Lord into two but ascribing some of them to his Godhead and some of them again to his manhood, but all of them to one [Son].

20. Now I have learned that the honourable and pious bishop John has written to certain of his acquaintances to the effect that, as he says, I have clearly taught and confessed in public utterance, the dis-

18 [1] Cf. Ephesians 6:19. — [2] Om. *ἕνα*. — [3] "God the Word from the Father". *ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος*. — [4] Syr. simplifies the sentence.

19 [1] "feeble statements" - either an erroneous translation of *ἰσχνομυθίας* or translator read *ἰσχνοφωνίας*. — [2] "God". *λόγον*. — [3] "was anointed". *προσχρίσασθαι*. Translator misread as *προσχρίεσθαι* (?), but see note no. 2 to Text (p. 36). — [4] Syr. simplifies the sentence.

tinction of natures but have also distinguished the expressions in accordance with each nature. For this very reason many [1] have been scandalized. It was again necessary to speak on this point too, so that your Perfection might not be ignorant of the fact that they imputed the opinion of Apollinarius to my letters and supposed that I was saying that Christ's body was without a soul and that there had occurred a mixture, confusion, mingling and change of God [2] into flesh, or of flesh into the divine nature, so that nothing is preserved purely as it is. And they thought, along with this, that I also adhere to the blasphemies of Arius and was not wanting [3] to speak of a difference in the expressions [4]. But your Perfection will bear witness that I am free from these blasphemies. Nevertheless, we had to make a defence to those who have been scandalized, and, for this reason, I have written to his Excellency that I have never believed like Arius or like Apollinarius and that I have never said that God the Word was changed into the flesh nor, again, that the flesh was changed into the Godhead [5]. I have never rejected the differences in the expressions, but I recognize our Lord as speaking divinely and humanly because he is God and Man. Therefore, with the intention of showing this, he wrote of me that I have taught the distinction of natures and have distinguished the
* p. 38 expressions * in accordance with each nature. These are not my words but they have recently [6] been propounded by him.

21. And I ought to add to all these this further fact: Bishop Paul of Homs has come to me and, a discussion taking place between us on the subject of the orthodox faith, he earnestly inquired of me whether I adhered to what was written by Bishop Athanasius of blessed memory to Epictetus bishop of Corinth. I told him: "If an uncorrupted manuscript has been preserved with you (for the enemies of the truth have often corrupted it) I agree with it". And he told me that he had the letter. He, then, wanted to compare it with our copies in order to see whether it was in error or not. And taking an ancient copy, which we had, and comparing it with his, he found his to be corrupt, and took a copy of it from us and conveyed it to the Church of Antioch [1]. And this is what bishop John has written to Ḥarina [2] about me: "He has

20 [1] τινες — [2] Om. λόγου. — [3] "and was not wanting"-διὰ τοι τὸ μὴ θέλειν. — [4] Om. the following explanatory clauses: καὶ τὰς μὲν εἶναι λέγειν κ.τ.λ.. — [5] Om. διὰ τὸ ἄτρεπτον εἶναι καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου. — [6] Gk. lacks "recently".

21 [1] Syr. simplifies this section. — [2] Καρρηνῷ(?) (= "[Bishop] of Ḥarrān"?).

interpreted our Lord's incarnation by re-establishing for us the tradition of our fathers." [3]

22. But if anyone brings a letter, written by the excellent priest Philip of Rome, to the effect that the holy bishop Xystus was indignant on account of the deposition of Nestorius, let not your Paternity [1] believe it. For he wrote and defined things conforming with the holy synod, which assembled, and he is of our persuasion. And if anybody brings a letter allegedly by me to the effect that we have changed our minds about what we did at Ephesus, let this letter too be null and void. For, by our Lord's grace, we are sound in our opinion and do not swerve from what is right [2].

HERE ENDS THE LETTER OF MAR CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA TO MAR ACACIUS OF MELITENE.

[3] Om. μικροῦ καὶ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, [ἀ'] οὖτος εἶπεν, γενέσθαι κινδυνεύουσαν.

22 [1] δεσπότης. — [2] Om. the concluding valediction.

III

* THE LETTER OF CYRIL, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, TO SUCCENSUS, BISHOP OF DIOCAESAREA IN ISAURIA

* p. 39

1. I have perused the memorandum sent by your Holiness and have been much gratified that though you are able to help both us and others by your learning [1], you yet urge [2] us to put in writing that which is in our mind and which we hold to well. The view, then, we have with respect to our Saviour's dispensation is the one which belonged also to our holy fathers who were before us. For we have read their labours and have thereby disciplined our mind to follow them without making any novel addition to their orthodox teaching.

2. But since your Perfection desires to learn whether it is right to speak of two natures in connection with Christ or not, I have decided to address myself to this point. A certain Diodore, who, so they say, was in former times one of those who degrade the Spirit [1], was converted and [2] joined the Orthodox church. Having got rid, so he thought, of the evil cancer of the Macedonian heresy, he fell into a further disease. For he thought and wrote that the Son born of the seed of David from the Holy Virgin is other and separate, and the Son the Word of God the Father is also other and separate. And hiding the wolf in sheep's clothing, he pretends to call Christ 'one', applying the
* p. 40 title ['Son'] solely to * the Only-begotten Son, begotten of God the Father; yet he also bestows it by way of the order of grace (to use his terminology) on him who is of David's seed; and he calls him Son, as one who has, so he asserts, been united with him who is truly Son. But he has been united not in the sense which we acknowledge, but only in dignity, power and honour.

3. Nestorius became this man's discipline and was obfuscated by his writings. [Nestorius] pretends to acknowledge one Christ, Son and Lord, but also divides into two the indivisible one [1], and declares that Man has been joined to God the Word in equality of honour and in

1 [1] Om. *πολλῆς*. — [2] Om. *ἀξιοῖς*.
2 [1] So the Syr.; *πνευματομάχος*. — [2] Gk. lacks "was converted and".
3 [1] *τὸν ἕνα καὶ ἀμέριστον* (Syr. om. *καί*).

title [2]. He divides the expressions laid down in the Gospel[s] and the Apostle[s] [3] with regard to Christ and asserts that some of them, being human, attach to the Man, but others of them, being solely divine, concern God the Word. Because [4] he frequently [5] separates and sets on his own as Man the one who was born of the Holy Virgin and again likewise separates on his own the one [6] who is from God the Father — because of this he does not acknowledge the Holy Virgin [as] Mother of God but [as] 'Mother of the Man' [7].

4. But as for us, these are not our tenets. But we are instructed by the divine Scriptures and our holy fathers to acknowledge one Son, Christ and Lord i.e. that Word divinely and ineffably begotten of God the Father [1] before the worlds, the same who in the last times [2] has been born for our sake in flesh from the Holy Virgin. And because she bore us [3] God who became man and incarnate [4], we acknowledge her to be 'Mother of God'. There is, then, one Son, one Lord, one Christ, both before his incarnation and after his incarnation. For the Son, the Word of the Father [5], is not one and he again who is of the Holy Virgin another. But that very one who was before the worlds is believed to have been born in the flesh from a * woman — not as though * p. 41 his Godhead acquired any beginning of existence or took its origin from the Holy Virgin, but rather, as I have said, the Word who [was] before the worlds is affirmed to have had fleshly birth from her. His flesh was his own, just as [6] the body of each one of us is his own.

5. Now since certain people accuse us of holding Apollinarius' view, and say: "If you call the Father's Word [1], who became man and incarnate, 'one Son' in strict unity [2], you may perhaps be imagining and wanting to suppose this: that confusion, mixture or intermingling of the Word and his body took place or that his body was changed into the nature of his Godhead", — we wisely repudiate this [3] cavilling charge, and assert that the Word from God the Father became one with his body, [a body] ensouled with a rational soul, in an ineffable and inconceivable manner, and he issued [as] man from a woman, becoming like us not by alteration of nature, but by the will of the divine

2 *τῇ ὁμωνυμίᾳ, τῇ ἰσοτιμίᾳ, τῇ ἀξίᾳ*; Syr. trsp. and om. *τῇ ἀξίᾳ*. — [3] *ἀποστολικοῖς κηρύγμασιν*. — [4] Om. *καί*. — [5] *πολλαχῶς*. — [6] Om. *λόγον*. — [7] *θεοτόκον ... ἀνθρωποτόκον*; Syr. om. *μᾶλλον*.
4 [1] Om. *μὲν ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. — [2] Om. *τοῦ αἰῶνος*. — [3] Gk. lacks "us". — [4] Om. *διὰ τοῦτο καί*. — [5] Om. *θεοῦ*. — [6] Om. *ἀμέλει*.
5 [1] Om. *θεοῦ*. — [2] Om. *καὶ συνεσταλμένην*. — [3] *ταύτην* instead of *ταύτῃ*.

dispensation. For he willed to become man without losing the fact of being God in his nature. Even [4] though he came down to our limitations and put on the form of a slave, he yet continued in his transcendent and natural Lordship and Godhead.

6. We therefore acknowledge as one [1], God the Word of God who was born with his flesh [2] ensouled with a rational soul in an ineffable and inconceivable manner, unconfusedly, unchangeably and unalterably. We confess one Son, Christ and Lord, the same both God and man, not another and another, but one and the same, since he is, and is recog-
* p. 42 nized as, both. And hence, sometimes he speaks * in human fashion as, by divine dispensation, man; at other times he gives utterance as God in the power of his Godhead. And we further declare this: that when we prudently examine the mode of his providential incarnation and closely scrutinize the mystery, we see that God the Word [3], who is from the Father, became man when he was incarnate without fashioning that sacred body from his noble [4] nature, but [5] he took it from the Virgin. Otherwise how could he have become man, if he had not had a human body? In our thinking, therefore, as I have said, about the mode of his providential [6] incarnation, we perceive that two natures have come together into a single indivisible unity free from confusion and change. For flesh is flesh and not Godhead, even if it be the flesh of God; and again also the Word is God and not flesh, even if by divine dispensation he made his flesh his own. So when we take this view we do no damage to the unity [7] which we declare came into being from two natures. But after the union we do not sunder the natures from each other or divide the one and indivisible Son into two sons, but we affirm one Son and, as our fathers have declared, one incarnate nature of the Word.

7. Therefore, in respect of what comes up to our cogitation and in respect of what is viewed only with the soul's eye of the way in which the Only-begotten became man, we speak of two natures, but of one Christ, one Son and one Lord, God the Word who became man and was incarnate. If you wish, let us take the example of the way in which we are men[1]. For we are composed of soul and body and perceive two natures, one of the body and another of the soul. But man is one, in a

[4] Om. ἀλλ' before εἰ καί.

6 [1] So Syr.; Gk. ἐνοῦντες. — [2] Om. ἁγίᾳ. — [3] ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος. — [4] θείας. — [5] Om. μᾶλλον. — [6] Lit. "his dispensation [economy] in flesh". — [7] τὴν εἰς ἑνότητα συνδρομήν.

7 [1] Om. καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς σύνθεσιν.

union of the two. The fact that he is composed of two natures does not make a single man into two men, but, * as I have said, one man * p. 43 composed of soul and body. For if we do away with the fact that the one and unique Christ, who after the union is indivisible, [results] from two and differing natures, [then] those who withstand the Orthodox [2] will say: "If one nature be his sum total, how did he become man or what flesh did he appropriate?".

8. And since I have found in the memorandum a hint of this sort of talk — that "after the resurrection the holy body of Christ our [1] Saviour changed into the nature of the Godhead so that all of it became Godhead [and Godhead only]", I mean to deal with this point. At one place the blessed Apostle [2] writes explaining to us the cause of God's incarnation[3]: "Because the law was impotent through the sickness of the flesh, God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, to condemn sin in his flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, in those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" [4]. And on another occasion he writes again: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through his death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, Satan; and deliver them who under fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For not from angels did he take, but from the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren" [5].

9. So we say that as a result of Adam's transgression, our nature [1] became subject to decay and our mind predominated by fleshly pleasures and by natural impulses. It was a matter of necessity for the salvation of all earthly men [2] that God the Word [3] should become man and appropriate human flesh * which had been subjected to decay * p. 44 and become enfeebled by sensuality, should nullify, because he is Life and the creator of life, the decay which is in the flesh and also rebuke the natural impulses which tend [4] towards sensuality. For thus was sin made dead in [5] it. And we remember too blessed Paul who calls our

[2] τῇ ὀρθῇ δοξῇ.

8 [1] πάντων ἡμῶν σωτῆρος. — [2] Παῦλος. — [3] Om. τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ. — [4] Romans 8:3-4. — [5] Hebrews 2:14-17.

9 [1] ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως. — [2] Om. ἡμῖν. — [3] τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον. — [4] ﻣﻴﻞ rendering δηλαδή (?). Perhaps = "meaning". — [5] ἣν γὰρ οὕτως νεκρωθῆναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν αὐτῇ.

natural impulse, "the law of sin" [6]. Therefore, since human flesh has become the Word's own flesh it has ceased being subject to decay; and because as God, who has appropriated flesh to himself [7], as I have said, he knew no sin, human flesh has ceased from its enfeeblement in sensuality. The Only-begotten God the Word [8] has not accomplished this for himself (for he is perpetually what he is), but he did it for us. For if we are subject to the evils resulting from Adam's transgression, the things of Christ must inevitably accrue to us — i.e. incorruptibility as well as the mortification of sin. Therefore, he became man and did not assume man to himself as Nestorius has asserted; and that he might be believed to have become man whilst remaining what he was, God in his nature, for this reason he is said to have hungered, to have been weary from the toil of the road, to have endured sleep, anxiety, grief and those other [9] painful sufferings which are not subject to hostile criticism. And again, in order to satisfy those who saw him that he was truly God, besides being man, he effected signs divinely, rebuking the sea, raising the dead and performing miracles [10]. And he also endured the cross in order that having accepted death in the flesh and not in the nature of his Godhead, he might become the first-born from the dead, might prepare a path of incorruptibility for men's nature, and, despoiling death, might take pity upon the souls imprisoned in Hades.

* p. 45 **10**. And after the Resurrection it was that very body of his * which had suffered, but no longer containing human weakness. For we affirm that it is no longer capable of fatigue or hunger [1] or anything of that kind, but is henceforth immortal [2] and not only that but life-giving too. For his body is [the body] of Life — that is to say [the body] of the Only-begotten and it is made radiant by divine glory and recognized as the body of God. Were anyone to call it a glorious, miraculous [3] and divine body in the same sense [4] that one would call a man's body [5] human — he would not be far from the right view. Hence, in my view, the blessed Apostle also says: "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet no longer do we know him so" [6]. Thus, as I have said, his body is God's and transcends all human [attributes]. But an earthly

[6] Romans 7:23,25. — [7] Om. *ἀποφήνας*. — [8] *τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος*. — [9] Om. *ἀνθρωπίνων*. — [10] Om. *τὰ ἕτερα*.

10 [1] Trsp. *πείνης ... κόπου*. — [2] *ἄφθαρτον*. — [3] Gk. lacks "glorious, miraculous and". Dogmatic addition? — [4] Om. *ἁμέλει*. — [5] Gk. lacks "body". — [6] 2 Corinthians 5:16.

body cannot be changed into the divine nature, unless we predicate of the Godhead createdness and the reception in its substance of what is not its by nature. For it is equally absurd for anyone to assert that the body has been changed [7] into the nature of the Godhead as that God [8] has been changed into the nature of flesh. Just as the latter is impossible (because he is immutable [9] in his nature) so is the former. For it is impossible for any of the creatures to be changed into the divine nature [10] — flesh is a created thing. Therefore, we call Christ's body 'divine' because it is God's body and is made resplendent with ineffable glory, is incorruptible, holy and life-giving. But as for its being changed into the divine nature, none of our holy fathers have thought or asserted this and we do not think so either.

11. Your Holiness must also take cognizance of the fact that Athanasius of blessed memory [1], the one-time bishop of Alexandria, wrote * a letter, things being disturbed at that time, to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, [a letter] full of orthodox doctrine. Now because Nestorius has been refuted out of it, those who have been standing up on behalf of the true faith have, through reading it, been stopping the mouths of those who want to think like him. But when some people saw that this confutation was too strong for them, they devised a scheme which was both vicious and worthy of the wickedness of their heresy. For they falsified the letter, missing bits out and adding bits to it and [then] published it, so that the saint might be thought to be in agreement with Nestorius [2]. It has, therefore, been necessary for us, lest any persons should display the falsified [version] [3], to take and send your Holiness a copy made from our texts. For Paul too, the Holy and pious bishop of Homs, when he came to us [4] at Alexandria, told [5] us about it and was found to possess a copy of it corrupted [6] by the heretics. He asked us for one made from our copies to be sent to Antioch and we sent it. * p. 46

12. Following in every way our holy fathers [1], we have composed one book against Nestorius's doctrine and another with reference to certain persons who have criticized the import in those chapters. These too I have sent to your Holiness so that if there are any [2] of the faith-

[7] *παθεῖν μεταβολήν*. — [8] "God", instead of *λόγος*. — [9] Om. *καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος*. — [10] Om. *οὐσίαν ἴδιον*.

11 [1] Om. *ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν*. — [2] Om. *καὶ τοῖς ἀφ' αὐτῶν*. — [3] Om. *κἀκεῖνο*. — [4] Gk. lacks "to us". — [5] *κατέστησε λόγους*. — [6] Om. *καὶ παραποιηθέν*.

12 [1] *ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἀρθοδοξίαις*. — [2] Om. *ἕτερα*.

ful [3] who have been overpowered by the impudent clamour of those people and who make the supposition in our case that we have gone back on what we wrote against Nestorius, then by reading they will learn [4] that rightly and correctly we rebuked him for his error and even now we constantly fight against [5] his blasphemies. And your Holiness, [5] with your ability to understand greater matters than these, will help us by writing to and praying for us.

HERE ENDS THE FIRST LETTER OF ST. CYRIL TO SUCCENSUS.

[3] Om. τε καὶ ὁμοφύχων ἡμῶν ἀδελφῶν. — [4] Om. ἐλεγχθεῖεν ... καί. — [5] καὶ νῦν οὐδὲν ἧττον ἐγκείμεθα πανταχοῦ μαχόμενοι.

IV

* THE SECOND LETTER BY CYRIL, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, TO SUCCENSUS OF DIOCAESAREA IN ISAURIA, CONCERNING THE PROBLEM OF 'TWO NATURES'

* p. 47

1. Truth reveals herself to those who love her, but is hidden and concealed [1] from intricate minds, for they shew themselves unworthy of viewing her with sound vision. And those who love the truth of the faith [2] "seek the Lord in the simplicity of their hearts", as it is written [3], but "those who tread twisted paths and have perverse hearts", as it is said in the Psalm [4], furnish themselves with intricate pretexts in their tortuous minds to pervert the fair ways of the Lord and to get the souls of simple folk to think [5] what is not right. I say this, because I have read your Holiness' memoranda and have found therein that which is wrongly proffered as an excuse by those who love [6] the perversity of false knowledge. These are [the points at issue]:

2. "*If Emmanuel is composed out of two natures, but after the union there is one incarnate nature of the Word, it then follows that we must assert he suffered in his own nature*".

Those sainted fathers of ours, who committed [1] to us the august faith [2], affirmed of him who is the Word from God the Father, being of his substance, being too the Only-begotten by whom all things were made, that he became incarnate and was made man; and we deny that those saints were ignorant of the fact that the body which belonged to [3] the Word was ensouled with * a rational soul. So he who says that the * p. 48 Word became incarnate does not mean his body apart from the rational soul [4]. For thus, as I think (and that is as I confidently confess) wise John the Evangelist declares of the Word, "He became flesh" [5] - not unsouled flesh [6] (far from it!) but neither altered nor changed. For he remained as he was (i.e. God in nature) but he accepted also to become

1 [1] Om. οἶμαι καὶ πειρᾶται. — [2] Gk. lacks "truth"; Syr. om. ἀμωμήτων. — [3] Wisdom of Solomon 1:2. — [4] ψαλμοῖς. Psalm 100:3. — [5] Om. χρῆναι. — [6] Om. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως.

2 [1] ὁρισάμενοι. — [2] Om. ὀρθῆς (before πίστεως) and σύμβολον. — [3] τὸ ἑνωθὲν τῷ λογῳ σῶμα (Syr. om. τὸ ἑνωθέν). — [4] οὐ δίχα ψυχῆς νοερᾶς ὁμολογεῖ τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἑνωθεῖσαν αὐτῷ (Syr. om. τὴν ἑνωθεῖσαν αὐτῷ). — [5] John 1:14. — [6] Om. ἑνωθέντα.

man and to be made like us in the flesh of a woman. And he yet remained one Son, but was not discarnate as he had been of old or prior to the time of his incarnation when he clad himself in our nature. Though the body containing a rational soul, which belonged to [7] God the Word begotten of the Father [8], is not consubstantial with him, nevertheless the intellect discerns differentiation in the unified natures. Hence we acknowledge one Son, Christ and Lord inasmuch as the Word became flesh — and when we say 'flesh' we mean 'man'. Why, then, must he suffer in his nature if one incarnate nature of the Son after the union is affirmed? For were it the case that within the conditions of the providential dispensation there was nothing capable of experiencing suffering, they would be speaking rightly, because, since there would be nothing capable of suffering, suffering must occur to the Word's nature. But if through our calling [his nature] 'incarnate' the whole concept of the incarnate dispensation is brought up (for he was incarnate in no other wise than by taking Abraham's seed, by being assimilated in all respects to his brethren and by assuming the form of a slave) how can they jabber about its being necessary for him to suffer in his nature, when it is his body which incurs suffering whilst the Word is impassible? [9]. Yet we do not dissociate him from suffering. For just as his body became his own, so all things pertaining to the body except sin [10] are, by providential appropriation [11], predicated of him.

* p. 49 **3.** *"*If there is one incarnate nature of the Word, it is absolutely necessary to speak of [1] mixture as having occurred inasmuch as the human nature has been reduced and filched away".*

Those who pervert things orthodox have again ignored the fact that there is in reality one incarnate nature of the Word. For if there is one Son, really and by nature the Word ineffably begotten of the Father and again proceeding as man from a woman with the assumption of [2] ensouled [3] flesh, he is not therefore to be divided into two persons or [4] two sons. But he remained one, not indeed discarnate or disembodied [5], but possessing his own body in indivisible union. And he who says this neither indicates confusion, mixture or anything of that kind [6], nor that any such thing as this must necessarily attach to

[7] Om. *ἑνωθὲν αὐτῷ*. — [8] *τῷ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς φύντι λογῷ*. — [9] "how can they jabber ... impassible?" - Syr. simplifies Gk. — [10] Om. *μόνης*. — [11] Om. *οὐδὲν ἧττον*.

3 [1] Gk. lacks "to speak of". — [2] Om. *οὐκ ἀφύχου μᾶλλον, ἀλλ'*. — [3] Om. *νοερῶς*. — [4] *καί*. — [5] Syr. ܟܣܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܟܝܢ ܟܣܝܐ ܟܝ. Cf. Gk. *οὐκ ἀσαρκος οὐδὲ ἄξω σώματος*. — [6] Om. *πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως*.

him [7]. For though the Only-begotten Son of God, who is incarnate and became man, is called 'one' by us, there is no consequent confusion made, as is asserted by them, nor is the Word changed into the nature of flesh or flesh changed into the Word. But each abides and is recognized in the particularity of its nature according to the account we have just given. The ineffable and unspeakable union has revealed to us the Son's single, but, as I have said, incarnate nature. For singleness is not predicated truly only of beings simple by nature, but also of beings brought together in composition — such as Man, who is compounded of body and soul. For these elements are heterogeneous and are in nature mutually dissimilar [8]; but united they make up the single nature of Man, even though within the compound there is a difference corresponding with the nature of those [elements] which have come together to [form] a unity. Those, then, who assert that "if there is one incarnate nature of the Word, * it inevitably follows that there must be confusion and mixture inasmuch as the human nature has been reduced and filched away", are talking rubbish. For it is neither 'reduced' nor, as they say, 'filched away'. For it suffices for a complete indication of the fact that he became man that we should say that he was incarnate. Were this not avowed by us, there would be room for their cavilling. But since ['incarnate'], must be added [to 'one nature'], where is there [any] sort of reduction or filching away?.

* p. 59

4. *"If the same Christ is conceived of as complete God and complete man, consubstantial with the Father in his Godhead and consubstantial with us in his manhood, where is the completeness if the human nature no longer exists? Where is that consubstantiality with us, if the nature [1] which we have no longer exists?"*

The solution and its defence [given] in the preceding chapter suffices for the clarification and explanation of these matters. For if, having called the Word 'one nature' we stopped short, without appending 'incarnate', and set aside the dispensation, there would perhaps have been something not implausible in their argument when they ask where the complete fulness of the manhood is or how our nature continues to exist. But since the complete fulness of the manhood and the indication of our nature is brought in through our calling it 'incarnate', let them cease leaning on a broken reed! For this would be

[7] Om. *πόθεν*. — [8] *οὐκ ὁμοούσια*.

4 [1] Om. *ἡ οὐσία, ὅπερ ἐστίν*.

the charge [2] against one who repudiates the dispensation and denies the incarnation, viz. that he has deprived the Son of his complete manhood. But if, as I have said, in virtue of the fact that 'incarnate' is predicated of him there is a clear and plain acknowledgement of the fact that he became man, there is no further obstacle to our calling [3] 'one' [4] him who is Son and Christ, the same both God and man; and as he is complete in his Godhead, so he is [complete] * in his manhood. And your Perfection expounds soundly and very wisely the rationale of our Saviour's suffering, [when you affirm] that the Only-begotten Son of God did not suffer fleshly [pains] in his nature in so far as he is known as, and is, God, but suffered in his corporeal nature. For the two things must needs be preserved in the case of that one who is truly Son : both that he did not suffer divinely and [also] that he should be affirmed to have suffered humanly. For he did suffer in his body[5]. But they, in their turn, suppose that we are introducing hereby what is called with them 'passibility' [6], divine 'passibility'. They do not understand the dispensation but are artfully transferring the suffering to the Man on his own, and are foolishly engaging in an injurious piety, so that God the Word shall not be acknowledged as Saviour, as the one who gave his blood for our sake, but the Man on his own who is acknowledged as Son by himself, he, it is, who is affirmed to have done this. But this view entirely uproots the incarnate dispensation and substitutes Man-worship for our glorious mystery[7]. They do not perceive that it is he who is "[descended] from the Jews in the flesh" i.e. "who is Christ of the seed of Jesse and David" whom blessed Paul called "Lord of Glory", "God blessed for ever"[8]. [Paul] proves that it was the Word's body which was nailed to the cross, and declared that it was [the Word's] very own body that was crucified.

* p. 51

5. I learn that [someone] has mooted another question additional to these. "*He who asserts that our Lord suffered in the flesh and nothing but the flesh, makes his suffering irrational and involuntary. But if one admits that he suffered with* [*his*] *intellectual soul so that the suffering is voluntary, there is no bar to affirming that he suffered in the nature of* [*his*] *humanity. If this is be true, how are we not supposing that two natures exist inseparably after the union ? * So if anyone says that Christ suffered for our sake in the flesh, he is affirming none other than this : that Christ suffered for our sake in our nature*".

* p. 52

[2] Om. δικαίως. — [3] νοεῖν. — [4] Om. καὶ μόνος. — [5] ἡ αὐτοῦ γὰρ πέπονθε σάρξ. — [6] Gk. lacks "passibility". — [7] Om. οὐκ ἀσυμφανῶς. — [8] 1 Corinthians 2:8; Romans 9:5.

This problem no less attacks those who assert that there is one incarnate nature of the Son. And because they want to render it a nullity, they are attempting at every point to prove that there are two natures in existence. But they have ignored the fact that things which are not merely mentally distinguishable must also be distinct because they are separately conceived of and set apart in isolation from one another [1], Let Man [2] be our illustration again. For we think of him as two natures — one of the soul and one of the body. But distinguishing them and accepting their differentiation solely in thought[3], we do not put their natures side by side nor, again, do we conceive of them as two separate [natures][4], but as a single unit. Hence we do not say that there are two, but that a single living being has been created from the two of them[5]. Therefore though the nature of Godhead and the nature [6] of humanity are predicated of Emmanuel, nevertheless that humanity belonged to the Word and one Son is conceived of with it. Now when divine [7] Scripture declared that "he suffered in the flesh"[8], it is better that we too should speak thus and not of his "suffering in the nature of the manhood"[9], even if when this is not said by people of perverse mind no damage is done to the mystery. For what is the nature of manhood if it is not ensouled flesh ? And we say that our [10] Lord suffered in the flesh. So by the trick of the problem they are saying that he suffered in the nature of the humanity, distinguishing it from the Word and setting it on its own and apart, so that two should be conceived of and not a single God the Word [11], who was incarnate and became man. Their added expression,'indivisible', is [12] understood by us as an indication of orthodox doctrine. But they do not so understand it, for indivisibility * to their way of thinking, in accordance with the vain babbling of Nestorius, is taken in quite a different manner. For they say that in equality of honour, in perfection of will [13] and in equality of authority [14] the man in whom he dwelt is indivisible from God the Word. Thus they do not assert these words in simplicity but with guile and deceit.

* p. 53

HERE ENDS THE SECOND LETTER OF CYRIL TO SUCCENSUS.

5 [1] "But ... another" - Syr. simplifies Gk. — [2] Om. [καθ'] ἡμᾶς before ἄνθρωπος. — [3] Om. καὶ ὡς ἐν ἰσχναῖς θεωρίαις ἤγουν νοῦ φαντασίαις. — [4] "conceive ... [natures]" - Syr. simplifies Gk. — [5] "but ... two of them" - δι' ἀμφοῖν δὲ τὸ ἓν ἀποτελεῖσθαι ζῷον — [6] Gk. lacks "nature". — [7] θεοπνεύστου. — [8] 1 Peter 4:1. — [9] Om. εἰ καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα. — [10] Gk. lacks "our". — [11] ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος. — [12] Om. πως. — [13] ταυτοβουλίᾳ. — [14] αὐθεντίᾳ.

V

* THE LETTER OF CYRIL, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, TO THE PRIEST EULOGIUS WHO WAS AT CONSTANTINOPLE

* p. 34

1. Certain persons are taking exception to the statement which the Orientals produced and are saying: "Why did the [Bishop] of Alexandria accept and praise those [people] although they used the words 'two natures'? But those who hold the views of Nestorius assert that he too thought in this way, [thereby] seizing control of those without accurate knowledge". Now we must tell these fault-finders this: that we are under no obligation to avoid and reject all that the heretics assert. For they confess many of the things which we too confess. Why, for example, when Arians declare that the Father is the "Creator of all" and "the Lord" should we, on this score, avoid this kind of confession? [1]. So, too, Nestorius, although he speaks of 'two natures' when indicating the difference between flesh and God the Word (for other is the nature of the Word and other that of the flesh) he yet does not acknowledge the union along with us. For uniting them, we acknowledge one Christ, one Son[2], one Lord and hence one incarnate nature of the Son — just as we can say in the case of an ordinary man, for he is of different natures, I mean soul and body. Reason and insight recognize the difference, but when we have united them we then get Man's one nature. Therefore, the fact of our recognizing a difference of natures does
* p. 35 not make us divide the one Christ * into two. But since all the Orientals suppose that we orthodox follow the view of Apollinarius or think that confusion or mixture occurred (for they use expressions like these to the effect that God the Word changed into the nature of the flesh and the flesh was converted into the nature of the Godhead) we deferred to them, not so that they should divide the one Son into two (far from it) but only so that we should acknowledge that no confusion or mixture occurred, but the flesh was flesh taken from woman and the Word was Word begotten of the Father; nevertheless the Christ, Son and Lord is one inasmuch as, in John's phrase, "the word was made flesh"[3].

1 [1] "confession" - ὁμολογίας. — [2] Syr. om. "the same" (τὸν αὐτὸν). — [3] John 1:14. —

We urged [4] them to pay attention to the reading of blessed Pope Athanasius' epistle, because there, when certain persons were contending and asserting that God the Word transformed a body for himself out of his own nature, he proves forcefully on all sides, that the body was not consubstantial with the Word. Now if the body was not consubstantial with the Word, there must be different natures [5] out of which the one and unique Christ is recognized. Moreover, let not this escape them: for where the word 'union' is used it does not mean the gathering of one thing, but of two or more things which are also different in nature from one another. So, if we speak of 'union', we are acknowledging the union of rationally ensouled flesh and the Word, and those who speak of two natures think thus. Nevertheless, when the union is acknowledged the things which have been united are no longer separate from one another, but, henceforth, [are] one Son, his one nature, inasmuch as the Word became incarnate. These points * the Orientals have acknowledged even if they were a little * p. 36 in the dark about the language. For how can people be following the opinion of Nestorius when they acknowledge that the same unique Word who was begotten of God the Father was also born of a woman in the flesh; that the Holy Virgin is the Mother of God; that his person is one and not two sons, nor two Christs, but one! For Nestorius in his discourses pretends to say "one Son and one Lord", but applies the Sonship and the Lordship to God the Word [6] on his own. But when he gets to the providential dispensation, he goes on to say that a different Lord, the woman-born man on his own, has been joined [to the Word] by authority and equality of honour. For when he says that God the Word is called Christ because of his connection with Christ, is it not plain that he is talking of two Christs if Christ possesses connection with Christ as another to another! But the Orientals have not said anything of this kind; they only distinguish the utterances. They distinguish in the following way: some of them, they say, are appropriate to God, some of them are human and some of them are common inasmuch as they possess at one and the same time what is appropriate to God and what [is appropriate] to man, but nevertheless that they are uttered by one and the same [person,

[4] I.e. presumably the Orientals. Gk. makes this a command to Eulogius - "urge them". See note no. 8 to Syr. Text (p. 35). [5] Lit. "another and another nature". — [6] τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου.

all which is] unlike Nestorius who allots some of them to God the Word on his own and some to another son [born] of a woman. Now it is one thing to recognize the distinction in the utterances and another thing to allot them to two different and distinct persons.

* p 57 2 * The epistle to Acacius, in particular, whose beginning runs : 5 "Salutation is a sweet and admirable thing to the brethren" has a good defence on all points. You have many letters in your file which you ought to take care to give out. Take the most venerable Chamberlain the two books sent by me (one against the blasphemies of Nestorius, the other containing the Acts at the Synod against Nestorius 10 and those who think like him), and my refutations of those who wrote against the chapters—two are bishops, Andreas and Theodoret. At the end of the book there are concise expositions of Christ's dispensation which are very good and profitable. Take him, likewise, five of the parchment letters : first, blessed Pope Athanasius' to Epictetus; 15 secondly, ours to John ; our two to Nestorius—the short and the long—and fifthly the one to Acacius, for he asked us for them.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

References are to the pages of the English translation. For the Old Testament the numbering of the LXX has been followed.

Genesis
32, 22-24 : 10
32, 30 f : 10

Exodus
20, 3 : 5

Deuteronomy
6, 4 : 5
18, 3 : 1
33, 8 f : 11
33, 9 : 12

Psalms
12, 4 : 2
17, 45 f : 10
32, 6 : 7
49, 3 : 8
77, 15 f : 12
77, 18 f : 12
100, 3 : 39

Proverbs
4, 25 : 2

Isaiah
32, 6 : 23
42, 8 : 14
44, 6 : 5
53, 7 f : 15

Jeremiah
4, 3 : 23
22, 17 : 2

Daniel
7, 9 f : 13
7, 13 f : 13

Joel
3, 1 : 9

Zephaniah
2, 1 : 22

Wisdom of Solomon
1, 1 : 23
1, 2 : 39

Baruch
3, 37 : 13

Matthew
10, 20 : 14
12, 46 f : 12
18, 20 : 2
22, 29 : 19
28, 19 : 16

Mark
8, 38 : 14

Luke
1, 2 : 2
8, 20 f : 12
22, 67 ff : 13

John
1, 1,3 : 7
1, 14 : 9, 26, 39, 44
1, 30 : 14
3, 31 : 8
6, 53 : 17
8, 23 : 8
8, 39, 40 : 28
8, 42 : 8
8, 58 : 14
9, 35 ff : 10
10, 30 : 6, 28
14, 6 : 6
14, 9 : 10
14, 9-10 : 28
16, 28 : 8
17, 3 : 1
17, 5 : 13
20, 22 : 18

Romans
1, 22 f : 4
6, 3 : 16
7, 23, 25 : 36
8, 3-4 : 35
9, 3-5 : 28
9, 4 f : 14
9, 5 : 42
10, 6 ff : 16

I Corinthians
2, 8 : 42
3, 11 : 3
8, 5-6 : 28
10, 4 : 12
15, 20 : 15

II Corinthians
4, 4 : 18
5, 16 : 36

Ephesians
4, 5 : 16
6, 19 : 29

Philippians
2, 6-8 : 8
2, 7 : 13, 27
2, 8 : 15

Colossians
1, 15 ff : 15
1, 18 : 15

I Timothy
1, 7 : 18

Titus
2, 11 f : 14

Hebrews
1, 3 : 7
2, 9 : 15
2, 14-17 : 35
3, 1 f : 11
7, 26 : 11
8, 1 : 13
13, 8 : 28

James
2, 20 : 1

1 Peter
3, 15 : 4, 24
4, 1 : 43

Jude
4 : 18

INDEX OF PLACE NAMES AND PROPER NAMES

Aaron, 11.
Abraham, 14, 28, 35, 40.
Acacius, Bishop of Aleppo, 21.
Acacius, Bishop of Melitene, 20, 46.
Adam, 35, 36.
Alexander, Priest, 1.
Alexandria, 37.
Anastasius, Priest, 1.
Andreas, Bishop, 46.
Antioch, Church of, 30, 37.
Apollinarius, 30, 33, 44.
Arians, 44.
Aristolaus, Tribune, 21.
Arius, 29, 30.
Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, 30, 37, 44, 46.
(Chrysoretes ?), Chamberlain, 46.
Daniel, 12.
David, King, 9, 12, 16, 18, 32, 42.
Diodore, 32.
Ephesus, Council of, 3, 21, 22, 23, 31, 46.
Epictetus, Bishop of Corinth, 30, 37, 46.
Ḥarīna (?), 30.
Ḥarrān, Bishop of (?), 30.
Isaiah, 15.
Jabbok, River of, 10.
Jacob, 10.
Jeremiah, 2.
Jerusalem, 2.
Jesse, 16, 18, 42.
John, the Baptist, 14.
John, Bishop of Antioch, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30, 46.
John, the Evangelist, 7, 8, 9, 39, 44.
John, Priest, 1.
Levi, 11.
Martinian, Priest, 1.
Maximian, Bishop of Constantinople, 20, 21.
Maximinius, the Deacon, 1.
Moses, 1, 5, 10, 11, 12.
Nestorius, 3, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 43, 44, 45, 46.
Nicaea, Council of, 2, 21, 22, 23.
Paregorius, Priest, 1.
Paul, the Apostle, 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 28, 29, 35, 36, 42.
Paul, Bishop of Homs, 21, 22, 30, 37.
Peter, the Apostle, 4.
Philip, the Apostle, 6, 28.
Philip, Priest (of Rome), 31.
Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople, 17.
Theodore, 18.
Theodoret, Bishop, 46.
(Theodosius), the Emperor, 20, 21.
Xystus, Bishop of Rome, 31.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Synopses of Letters v
Method of translating the text ix
Select Bibliography x

Translations

I. *The Letter on the Nicene Creed* 1
II. *The Letter to Acacius of Melitene* 20
III. *The First Letter to Succensus* 32
IV. *The Second Letter to Succensus* 39
V. *The Letter to Eulogius the Priest* 44

Index of Biblical References 47

Index of Place Names and Proper Names 49